SOCIALISM

[illegible]

L 20 XIII

SOCIALISM

Tracts for the Times

ALMA COLLEGE
335
LIBRARY
L55-XIII
Alma, California

Property of
CTSA
Please return to
aduate Theological
Union Library

FATHERS LIBRARY
ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH
SAN JOSE, CAL.

NEW YORK
THE AMERICA PRESS
59 East Eighty-third St.
1912

Reprints from

THE CATHOLIC MIND

1908-1910

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Condition of the Working Classes	1
The Genesis of Socialism	50
Christian Labor Unions in Germany	82
Socialism	109
Plain Words on Socialism	124
Catholics and the Social Movement	157
Socialism and Christianity	170
The Socialist Movement in England	206
The Morality of English Socialism	229
Some Ways and Means of Social Study	255

Foreword

Frequent requests are made for various articles on Socialism which from time to time since 1903 have appeared in *The Catholic Mind*. As *The Catholic Mind* is published chiefly for subscribers, the additional copies printed with every issue are soon exhausted. To satisfy these requests, as well as to meet the wishes of many who would be pleased to have these several articles within easy reach, they are now reprinted and bound in one volume. As an introduction to this valuable set of documents on Socialism, the famous Encyclical of Leo XIII is also placed in the compilation. The subject of Socialism is one of growing importance, in the intricacies of which no surer guide can be selected than the great Pontiff who gave to the Catholic world in this Encyclical the fruit of his long experience and deep wisdom. His office of Chief Pastor would of itself entitle the Encyclical to the place of honor here accorded it. The names of the distinguished writers whose articles are reproduced in the collection are a guarantee of the merit of their contributions to the literature on Socialism. There is no desire to profit by this publication, but only to further a good word. The price has been limited to the cost of publication.

Condition of the Working Classes

(*Encyclical "Rerum Novarum" of Leo XIII, May* 15, 1891.)

That the spirit of revolutionary change, which has long been disturbing the nations of the world, should have passed beyond the sphere of politics and made its influence felt in the cognate sphere of practical economics is not surprising. The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable, in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits and the marvelous discoveries of science; in the changed relations between masters and workmen; in the enormous fortunes of some few individuals, and the utter poverty of the masses; in the increased self-reliance and closer mutual combination of the working classes; as also, finally, in the prevailing moral degeneracy. The momentous gravity of the state of things now obtaining fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men are discussing it; practical men are proposing schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and rulers of nations are all busied with it—and actually there is no question which has taken a deeper hold on the public mind.

Therefore, Venerable Brethren, as on former occasions when it seemed opportune to refute false teaching, we have addressed you in the interests of the Church and of the common weal, and have issued Letters bearing on "Political Power," "Human Liberty," "The Christian Constitution of the State," and like matters, so have we thought it expedient now to speak on The Condition of the Working Classes. It is a subject on which we

have already touched more than once, incidentally. But in the present Letter, the responsibility of the Apostolic office urges us to treat the question of set purpose and in detail, in order that no misapprehension may exist as to the principles which truth and justice dictate for its settlement. The discussion is not easy, nor is it void of danger. It is no easy matter to define the relative rights and mutual duties of the rich and of the poor, of Capital and of Labor. And the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators are intent on making use of these differences of opinion to pervert men's judgments and to stir up the people to revolt.

But all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and found quickly, for the misery and wretchedness pressing so heavily and unjustly at this moment on the vast majority of the working classes.

For the ancient workingmen's Guilds were abolished in the last century, and no other organization took their place. Public institutions and the very laws have set aside the ancient religion. Hence by degrees it has come to pass that workingmen have been surrendered, all isolated and helpless, to the hard-heartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition. The mischief has been increased by rapacious usury, which, although more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different guise, but with the like injustice, still practised by covetous and grasping men. To this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals; so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery.

THE SOCIALIST SOLUTION; ITS REFUTATION

To remedy these wrongs the Socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by muncipal bodies. They hold that by thus transferring property from private individuals to the community, the present mischievous state of things will be set to rights, inasmuch as each citizen will then get his fair share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their contentions are so clearly powerless to end the controversy that were they carried into effect the workingman himself would be among the first to suffer. They are, moreover, emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring State action into a sphere not within its competence, and create utter confusion in the community.

PRIVATE PROPERTY A NATURAL RIGHT

It is surely undeniable that, when a man engages in remunerative labor, the impelling reason and motive of his work is to obtain property, and thereafter to hold it as his very own. If one man hires out to another his strength or skill, he does so for the purpose of receiving in return what is necessary for sustenance and education; he therefore expressly intends to acquire a right full and real, not only to the remuneration, but also to the disposal of such remuneration just as he pleases. Thus, if he lives sparingly, saves money, and, for greater security, invests his savings in land, the land, in such case, is only his wages under another form; and, conse-

quently, a workingman's little estate thus purchased should be as completely at his full disposal as are the wages he receives for his labor. But it is precisely in such power of disposal that ownership obtains, whether the property consist of land or chattels. Socialists, therefore, by endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community at large, strike at the interests of every wage-earner, since they would deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thereby of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition in life.

What is of far greater moment, however, is the fact that the remedy they propose is manifestly against justice. For every man has by nature the right to possess property as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation, for the brute has no power of self-direction, but is governed by two main instincts, which keep his powers on the alert, impel him to develop them in a fitting manner, and stimulate and determine him to action without any power of choice. One of these instincts is self-preservation, the other the propagation of the species. Both can attain their purpose by means of things which lie within range; beyond their verge the brute creation cannot go, for they are moved to action by their senses only, and in the special direction which these suggest. But with man it is wholly different. He possesses, on the one hand, the full perfection of the animal being, and hence enjoys, at least as much as the rest of the animal kind, the fruition of things material. But animal nature, however perfect, is far from representing the human being in its completeness, and is in truth but humanity's humble handmaid, made to serve and to obey. It is the mind, or reason,

which is the predominant element in us who are human creatures; it is this which renders a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially and completely from the brute. And on this very account—that man alone among the animal creation is endowed with reason—it must be within his right to possess things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living things do, but to have and to hold them in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only things that perish in the use of them, but those also which, though they be used, continue for further use in after time.

This becomes still more clearly evident if man's nature be considered a little more deeply. For man, fathoming by his faculty of reason matters without number, and linking the future with the present, becoming, furthermore, by taking enlightened forethought, master of his own acts, guides his ways under the eternal law and the power of God, Whose Providence governs all things. Wherefore it is in his power to exercise his choice not only as to matters that regard his present welfare, but also about those which he deems may be for his advantage in time yet to come. Hence man not only can possess the fruits of the earth, but also the very soil, inasmuch as from the produce of the earth he has to lay by provision for the future. Man's needs do not die out, but recur; although satisfied to-day, they demand fresh supplies for to-morrow. Nature accordingly owes to man a storehouse that shall never fail, affording the daily supply for his daily wants. And this he finds solely in the inexhaustible fertility of the earth.

Neither do we, at this stage, need to bring into action the interference of the State. Man precedes the State, and possesses, prior to the formation of any State, the

right of providing for the sustenance of his body. Now to affirm that God has given the earth for the use and enjoyment of the whole human race is not to deny that private property is lawful. For God has granted the earth to mankind in general, not in the sense that all, without distinction, can deal with it as they like, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to any one in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry, and by the laws of individual races. Moreover, the earth, even though apportioned among private owners, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all, inasmuch as there is no one who does not sustain life from what the land produces. Those who do not possess the soil contribute their labor; hence it may truly be said that all human subsistence is derived either from labor on one's own land, or from some toilsome calling which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself, or in that which is exchanged for what the land brings forth.

Here, again, we have further proof that private ownership is in accordance with the law of nature. Truly, that which is required for the preservation of life, and for life's well-being, is produced in great abundance from the soil, but not until man has brought it into cultivation and expended upon it his solicitude and skill. Now, when man thus turns the activity of his mind and the strength of his body towards procuring the fruits of nature, by such act he makes his own that portion of nature's field which he cultivates—that portion on which he leaves, as it were, the impress of his individuality; and it cannot but be just that he should possess that portion as his very own, and have a right to hold it without any one being justified in violating that right.

So strong and convincing are these arguments that it seems amazing that some should now be setting up anew certain obsolete opinions in opposition to what is here laid down. They assert that it is right for private persons to have the use of the soil and its various fruits, but that it is unjust for any one to possess outright either the land on which he has built or the estate which he has brought under cultivation. But those who deny these rights do not perceive that they are defrauding man of what his own labor has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition: it was wild before, now it is fruitful; was barren, but now brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved the land becomes so truly part of itself as to be in great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that the fruit of a man's own sweat and labor should be possessed and enjoyed by any one else? As effects follow their cause, so is it just and right that the results of labor should belong to those who have bestowed their labor.

With reason, then, the common opinion of mankind, little affected by the few dissentients who have contended for the opposite view, has found in the careful study of nature, and in the laws of nature, the foundations of the division of property, and the practice of all ages has consecrated the principle of private ownership, as being preeminently in conformity with human nature, and as conducing in the most unmistakable manner to the peace and tranquillity of human existence. The same principle is confirmed and enforced by the civil laws—laws which, so long as they are just, derive from the law of nature their binding force. The authority of the Divine Law adds its sanction, forbidding us in severest terms even

to covet that which is another's: *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his.*(1)

THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY PROVED BY THE FAMILY

The rights here spoken of, belonging to each individual man, are seen in much stronger light when considered in relation to man's social and domestic obligations. In choosing a state of life, it is indisputable that all are at full liberty to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to observing virginity or to bind themselves by the marriage tie. No human law can abolish the natural and original right of marriage, nor in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God's authority from the beginning. *Increase and multiply.*(2) Hence we have the Family; the "society" of a man's house,—a society limited indeed in numbers, but no less a true "society," anterior to every kind of State or nation, invested with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the civil community.

That right of property, therefore, which has been proved to belong naturally to individual persons, must in like wise belong to a man in his capacity of head of a family; nay, such person must possess this right so much the more clearly in proportion as his position multiplies his duties. For it is a most sacred law of nature that a father should provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten; and, similarly, nature dictates that a man's children, who carry on, so to speak, and

(1) Deut. v, 21.
(2) Gen. i, 28.

continue his own personality, should be by him provided with all that is needful to enable them to keep themselves honorably from want and misery amid the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now, in no other way can a father effect this except by the ownership of lucrative property, which he can transmit to his children by inheritance. A family, no less than a State, is, as we have said, a true society, governed by a power within its sphere, that is to say, by the father. Provided, therefore, the limits which are prescribed by the very purposes for which it exists be not transgressed, the Family has at least equal rights with the State in the choice and pursuit of the things needful to its preservation and its just liberty.

We say at least equal rights; for inasmuch as the domestic household is antecedent, as well in idea as in fact, to the gathering of men into a community, the family must necessarily have rights and duties which are prior to those of the Community, and founded more immediately in nature. If the citizens of a State—in other words, the families—on entering into association and fellowship, were to experience at the hands of the State hindrance instead of help, and were to find their rights attacked instead of being upheld, such association should be held in detestation, rather than be an object of desire.

The contention, then, that the civil government should at its option intrude into and exercise intimate control over the Family and the household is a great and pernicious error. True, if a family finds itself in exceeding distress, utterly deprived of the counsel of friends, and without any prospect of extricating itself, it is right that extreme necessity be met by public aid, since each family is a part of the commonwealth. In like manner, if within the precincts of the household there occur grave dis-

turbance of mutual rights, public authority should intervene to force each party to yield to the other its proper due; for this is not to deprive citizens of their rights, but justly and properly to safeguard and strengthen them. But the rulers of the State must go no further: here nature bids them stop. Paternal authority can be neither abolished nor absorbed by the State; for it has the same source as human life itself. "The child belongs to the father," and is, as it were, the continuation of the father's personality; and, speaking strictly, the child takes its place in civil society, not of its own right, but in its quality as member of the family in which it is born. And for the very reason that "the child belongs to the father," it is, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, "before it attains the use of free-will, under power and charge of its parents."(1) The Socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and setting up a State supervision, act *against natural justice,* and break into pieces the stability of all family life.

And not only is such interference unjust, but it is quite certain to harass and worry all classes of citizens, and subject them to odious and intolerable bondage. It would throw open the door to envy, to mutual invective, and to discord; the sources of wealth themselves would run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry; and that ideal equality about which they entertain pleasant dreams would be in reality the leveling down of all to a like condition of misery and degradation.

Hence it is clear that the main tenet of Socialism, community of goods, must be utterly rejected, since it only

(1) Summa, 2a 2ae Q. x, Art. 12.

injures those whom it would seem meant to benefit, is directly contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonweal. The first and most fundamental principle, therefore, if one would undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property. This being established, we proceed to show where the remedy sought for must be found.

NO PRACTICAL SOLUTION WITHOUT RELIGION

We approach the subject with confidence, and in the exercise of the rights which manifestly appertain to us, for no practical solution of this question will be found apart from the intervention of religion and of the Church. It is We who are the chief guardian of Religion and the chief dispenser of what pertains to the Church, and We must not by silence neglect the duty incumbent upon us. Doubtless this most serious question demands the attention and the efforts of others beside ourselves—to wit, of the rulers of States, of employers of labor, of the wealthy, aye, of the working classes themselves, for whom We are pleading. But We affirm without hesitation that all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the Church. It is the Church that insists, on the authority of the Gospel, upon those teachings whereby the conflict can be brought to an end, or rendered, at least, far less bitter; the Church uses her efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by her precepts the life and conduct of each and all; the Church improves and betters the condition of the workingman by means of numerous useful organizations; does her best to enlist the services of all ranks in discussing and endeavoring to

meet, in the most practical way, the claims of the working classes; and acts from the positive view that for these purposes recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the intervention of the law and of State authority.

LABOR AND SUFFERING MUST EXIST

Let it, then, be taken as granted, in the first place, that the condition of things human must be endured, for it is impossible to reduce civil society to one dead level. Socialists may in that intent do their utmost, but all striving against nature is in vain. There naturally exist among mankind manifold differences of the most important kind; people differ in capacity, skill, health, strength; and unequal fortune is a necessary result of unequal condition. Such inequality is far from being disadvantageous either to individuals or to the community. Social and public life can only be maintained by means of various kinds of capacity for business and the playing of many parts; and each man, as a rule, chooses the part which suits his own peculiar domestic condition. As regards bodily labor, even had man never fallen from *the state of innocence,* he would not have remained wholly unoccupied; but that which would then have been his free choice and his delight became afterwards compulsory, and the painful expiation for his disobedience. *Cursed is the earth in thy work; with labor and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life.*(1) In like manner, the other pains and hardships of life will have no end or cessation on earth; for the consequences of sin are bitter and hard to bear, and they must accompany man so

(1) Gen. iii, 17.

long as life lasts. To suffer and to endure, therefore, is the lot of humanity; let them strive as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which beset it. If any there are who pretend differently—who hold out to a hard-pressed people the boon of freedom from pain and trouble, an undisturbed repose, and constant enjoyment—they delude the people and impose upon them, and their lying promises will only one day bring forth evils worse than the present. Nothing is more useful than to look upon the world as it really is—and at the same time to seek elsewhere, as we have said, for the solace of its troubles.

CLASS SHOULD HELP CLASS

The great mistake made in regard to the matter now under consideration is to take up with the notion that class is naturally hostile to class, and that the wealthy and the workingmen are intended by nature to live in mutual conflict. So irrational and so false is this view that the direct contrary is the truth. Just as the symmetry of the human frame is the resultant of the disposition of the bodily members, so in a State it is ordained by nature that these two classes should dwell in harmony and agreement, and should, as it were, groove into one another, so as to maintain the balance of the body politic. Each needs the other; Capital cannot do without Labor, nor Labor without Capital. Mutual agreement results in pleasantness of life and the beauty of good order; while perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and savage barbarity. Now, in preventing such strife as this, and in uprooting it, the efficacy of Christian institutions is marvelous and manifold. First of all,

there is no intermediary more powerful than Religion (whereof the Church is the interpreter and guardian) in drawing the rich and the poor bread-winners together, by reminding each class of its duties to the other, and especially of the obligations of justice. Thus Religion teaches the laboring man and the artisan to carry out honestly and fairly all equitable agreements freely entered into; never to injure the property nor to outrage the person of an employer; never to resort to violence in defending their own cause, nor to engage in riot or disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises, and excite foolish hopes which usually end in useless regrets, and the loss of all they possess. Religion teaches the wealthy owner and the employer that their work-people are not to be accounted their slaves; that in every man they must respect his dignity and worth as a man and as a Christian; that labor is not a thing to be ashamed of, if we lend ear to right reason and to Christian philosophy, but is an honorable calling, enabling a man to sustain his life in a way upright and creditable; and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical power. Again, therefore, the Church teaches that, as Religion and things spiritual and mental are among the workingman's main concerns, the employer is bound to see that the worker has time for his religious duties; that he be not exposed to corrupting influences and dangerous occasions; and that he be not led away to neglect his home and family, or to squander his earnings. Furthermore, the employer must never tax his work-people beyond their strength, or employ them in work unsuited to their sex or age. His great

and principal duty is to give every one a fair wage. Doubtless before deciding whether wages are adequate, many things have to be considered; but wealthy owners and all masters of labor should be mindful of this—that to exercise pressure upon the indigent and the destitute for the sake of gain, and to gather one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine. To defraud anyone of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of Heaven. *Behold, the hire of the laborers . . . which by fraud hath been kept back by you, crieth aloud; and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.*(1) Lastly, the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workmen's earnings, whether by force, by fraud, or by usurious dealing; and with all the greater reason because the laboring man is, as a rule, weak and unprotected, and because his slender means should in proportion to their scantiness be accounted sacred.

Were these precepts carefully obeyed and followed out, would they not be sufficient of themselves to keep under all strife and all its causes?

THE RICH MUST HELP THE POOR.

But the Church, with Jesus Christ as her Master and Guide, aims higher still. She lays down precepts yet more perfect, and tries to bind class to class in friendliness and good feeling. The things of earth cannot be understood or valued aright without taking into consideration the life to come, the life that will know no death. Exclude the idea of futurity, and forthwith the very

(1) James v, 4.

notion of what is good and right would perish; nay, the whole scheme of the universe would become a dark and unfathomable mystery. The great truth which we learn from Nature herself is also the grand Christian dogma on which Religion rests as on its foundation—that when we have given up this present life, then shall we really begin to live. God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting: He has given us this world as a place of exile, and not as our abiding-place. As for riches and the other things which men call good and desirable, whether we have them in abundance, or lack them altogether—so far as eternal happiness is concerned—it matters little; the only important thing is to use them aright. Jesus Christ, when He redeemed us with *plentiful redemption,* took not away the pains and sorrows which in such large proportion are woven together in the web of our mortal life. He transformed them into motives of virtue and occasions of merit: and no man can hope for eternal reward unless he follow in the blood-stained footprints of his Saviour. *If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him.*(1) Christ's labors and sufferings, accepted of His own free-will, have marvelously sweetened all suffering and all labor. And not only by His example, but by His grace and by the hope held forth of everlasting recompense, has He made pain and grief more easy to endure; *for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory.*(2)

---

(1) II Tim. ii, 12.
(2) II Cor. iv, 17.

Therefore those whom fortune favors are warned that freedom from sorrow and abundance of earthly riches are no warrant for the bliss that shall never end, but rather are obstacles;(1) that the rich should tremble at the threatenings of Jesus Christ—threatenings so unwonted in the mouth of Our Lord(2)—and that a most strict account must be given to the Supreme Judge for the use we have made of all we possess. The chief and most excellent rule for the right use of money is one which the heathen philosophers hinted at, but which the Church has traced out clearly, and has not only made known to men's minds, but has impressed upon their lives. It rests on the principle that it is one thing to have a right to the possession of money, and another to have a right to use money as one wills. Private ownership, as we have seen, is the natural right of man; and to exercise that right, especially as members of society, is not only lawful, but absolutely necessary. "It is lawful," says St. Thomas of Aquin, "for a man to hold private property; and it is also necessary for the carrying on of human existence."(3) But if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies without hesitation in the words of the same holy Doctor: "Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without hesitation when others are in need. Whence the Apostle saith, Command the rich of this world . . . to offer with no stint, to apportion largely."(4) True, no one is commanded to distribute

(1) Matt. xix, 23-24.
(2) Luke vi, 24-25.
(3) Summa 2a 2ae Q. 66, Art. 2.
(4) Ibid. Q. 65, Art. 2.

to others that which is required for his own needs and those of his household; nor even to give away what is reasonably required to keep up becomingly his condition in life; "for no one ought to live other than becomingly."(1) But when what necessity demands has been supplied, and one's standing fairly taken thought for, it becomes a duty to give to the indigent out of what remains over. *That which remaineth, give alms.*(2) It is a duty, not of justice (save in extreme cases), but of Christian charity—a duty not enforced by human law. But the laws and judgments of men must yield place to the laws and judgments of Christ the true God, Who in many ways urges upon His followers the practice of almsgiving—*It is more blessed to give than to receive;*(3) and Who will count a kindness done or refused to the poor as done or refused to Himself—*As long as you did it to one of these My least Brethren, you did it to Me.*(4) To sum up then what has been said:—Whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of temporal blessings, whether they be external and corporeal, or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them as the steward of God's Providence, for the benefit of others. "He that hath a talent," says St. Gregory the Great, "let him see that he hide it not; he that hath abundance, let him quicken himself to mercy and generosity; he that hath art and skill, let him do his best to

(1) Ibid. Q. 32, Art. 6.
(2) Luke xi, 41.
(3) Acts, xx, 35.
(4) Matt. xxv, 40.

share the use and the utility thereof with his neighbor."(1)

THE POOR MUST ACCEPT THEIR LOT.

As for those who possess not the gifts of fortune, they are taught by the Church that in God's sight poverty is no disgrace, and that there is nothing to be ashamed of in seeking one's bread by labor. This is enforced by what we see in Christ Himself, Who, *whereas He was rich, for our sakes became poor;*(2) and Who, being the Son of God, and God Himself, chose to seem and to be considered the son of a carpenter—nay did not disdain to spend a great part of His life as a carpenter Himself. *Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?*(3) From the contemplation of this Divine exemplar, it is more easy to understand that the true worth and nobility of man lies in his moral qualities, that is, in virtue; that virtue is, moreover, the common inheritance of men, equally within the reach of high and low, rich and poor; and that virtue, and virtue alone, wherever found, will be followed by the rewards of everlasting happiness. Nay, God Himself seems to incline rather to those who suffer misfortune; for Jesus Christ calls the poor "blessed": *Blessed are the poor in spirit;*(4) He lovingly invites those in labor and grief to come to Him for solace: *"Come to Me all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you";*(5) and He displays the tenderest char-

(1) St. Gregory the Great, in Evang. Hom. x, n. 7.
(2) II Cor. viii, 9.
(3) Mark vi, 3.
(4) Matt. v, 3.
(5) Ibid. xi, 28.

ity towards the lowly and the oppressed. These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of those who are well-to-do, and to cheer the spirit of the afflicted; to incline the former to generosity and the latter to meek resignation. Thus the separation which pride would set up tends to disappear, nor will it be difficult to make rich and poor join hands in friendly concord.

But, if Christian precepts prevail, the respective classes will not only be united in the bonds of friendship, but also in those of brotherly love. For they will understand and feel that all men are children of the same common Father, who is God; that all have alike the same last end, which is God Himself, Who alone can make either men or angels absolutely and perfectly happy; that each and all are redeemed and made sons of God, by Jesus Christ, *the first-born among many brethren;* that the blessings of nature and the gifts of grace belong to the whole human race in common, and that from none except the unworthy is withheld the inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven. *If sons, heirs also; heirs indeed of God, and co-heirs of Christ.*(1)

THE CHURCH SERVES SOCIETY BY UPHOLDING CHRISTIANITY.

Such is the scheme of duties and of rights which is shown forth to the world by the Gospel. Would it not seem that, were society penetrated with ideas like these, strife must quickly cease?

But the Church, not content with pointing out the remedy, also applies it. For the Church does her utmost

(1) Rom. viii, 17.

to teach and to train men, and to educate them; and by the intermediary of her bishops and clergy diffuses her salutary teachings far and wide. She strives to influence the mind and the heart so that all may willingly yield themselves to be formed and guided by the commandments of God. It is precisely in this fundamental and momentous matter, on which everything depends, that the Church possesses a power peculiarly her own. The agencies which she employs are given to her by Jesus Christ Himself for the very purpose of reaching the hearts of men, and derive their efficiency from God. They alone can reach the innermost heart and conscience, and bring men to act from a motive of duty, to resist their passions and appetites, to love God and their fellow-men with a love that is singular and supreme, and to break down courageously every barrier which stands in the way of a virtuous life.

On this subject we need but recall for one moment the examples recorded in history. Of these facts there cannot be any shadow of doubt: for instance, that civil society was renovated in every part by the teachings of Christianity; that in the strength of that renewal the human race was lifted up to better things—nay, that it was brought back from death to life, and to so excellent a life that nothing more perfect had been known before, or will come to be known in the ages that have yet to be. Of this beneficent transformation, Jesus Christ was at once the first cause and the final end; as from Him all came, so to Him was all to be brought back. For when the human race, by the light of the Gospel message, came to know the grand mystery of the Incarnation of the Word and the redemption of man, at once the life of Jesus Christ, God and Man, pervaded every race and nation,

and interpenetrated them with His faith, His precepts and His laws. And if Society is to be healed now, in no other way can it be healed save by a return to Christian life and Christian institutions. When a society is perishing, the wholesome advice to give to those who would restore it is to recall it to the principles from which it sprang; for the purpose and perfection of an association is to aim at and to attain that for which it was formed; and its efforts should be put in motion and inspired by the end and object which originally gave it being. So that to fall away from its primal constitution implies disease; to go back to it, recovery. And this may be asserted with utmost truth both of the State in general and of that body of its citizens—by far the great majority—who sustain life by their labor.

SHE IS ALSO SOLICITOUS ABOUT THE TEMPORAL INTEREST OF HER CHILDREN.

Neither must it be supposed that the solicitude of the Church is so pre-occupied with the spiritual concerns of her children as to neglect their temporal and earthly interests. Her desire is that the poor, for example, should rise above poverty and wretchedness, and better their condition in life; and for this she earnestly strives. By the very fact that she calls men to virtue and forms them to its practice, she promotes this in no slight degree. Christian morality, when adequately and completely practised, leads of itself to temporal prosperity, for it merits the blessing of that God Who is the source of all blessings; it powerfully restrains the greed of possession and the thirst for pleasure—twin plagues, which too often make a man who is void of self-restraint mis-

erable in the midst of abundance;(1) it makes men supply for the lack of means through economy, teaching them to be content with frugal living, and further, keeping them out of the reach of those vices which devour not small incomes merely, but large fortunes, and dissipate many a goodly inheritance.

The Church, moreover, intervenes directly in behalf of the poor, by setting on foot and maintaining many associations which she knows to be efficient for the relief of poverty. Herein again she has always succeeded so well as to have even extorted the praise of her enemies. Such was the ardor of brotherly love among the earliest Christians that numbers of those who were in better circumstances, despoiled themselves of their possessions in order to relieve their brethren; whence *neither was there any one needy among them.*(2) To the order of Deacons, instituted for that very purpose, was committed by the Apostles the charge of the daily distributions; and the Apostle Paul, though burdened with the solicitude of all the churches, hesitated not to undertake laborious journeys in order to carry the alms of the faithful to the poorer Christians. Tertullian calls these contributions, given voluntarily by Christians in their assemblies, deposits of piety; because, to cite his own words, they were employed "in feeding the needy, in burying them, in the support of youths and maidens destitute of means and deprived of their parents, in the care of the aged, and the relief of the shipwrecked."(3)

Thus by degrees came into existence the patrimony

(1) I Tim. vi, 10.
(2) Acts iv, 34.
(3) Apologia Secunda, 39.

which the Church has guarded with religious care as the inheritance of the poor. Nay, to spare them the shame of begging, the common Mother of rich and poor has exerted herself to gather together funds for the support of the needy. The Church has stirred up everywhere the heroism of charity, and has established congregations of Religious and many other useful institutions for help and mercy, so that hardly any kind of suffering could exist which has not been afforded relief. At the present day many there are who, like the heathen of old, seek to blame and condemn the Church for such eminent charity. They would substitute in its stead a system of relief organized by the State. But no human expedients will ever make up for the devotedness and self-sacrifice of Christian charity. Charity, as a virtue, pertains to the Church; for virtue it is not, unless it be drawn from the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ; and whosoever turns his back on the Church cannot be near to Christ.

It cannot, however, be doubted that to attain the purpose we are treating of, not only the Church, but all human agencies must concur. All who are concerned in the matter should be of one mind, and according to their ability, act together. It is with this as with the Providence that governs the world; the results of causes do not usually take place save where all the causes cooperate.

THE STATE SHOULD PROMOTE THE GENERAL GOOD.

It is sufficient, therefore, to inquire what part the State should play in the work of remedy and relief.

By the State we here understand, not the particular form of government prevailing in this or that nation, but

the State as rightly apprehended; that is to say, any government conformable in its institutions to right reason and natural law, and to those dictates of the Divine wisdom which We have expounded in the Encyclical on "The Christian Constitution of the State." The foremost duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, shall be such as of themselves to realize public well-being and private prosperity. This is the proper scope of wise statesmanship and the work of the heads of the State. Now, a State chiefly prospers and thrives by morality, by well-regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, the moderation and equal apportionment of public taxes, the progress of the arts and of trade, the abundant yield of the land—by everything, in fact, which makes the citizens better and happier. Hereby, then, it lies in the power of a ruler to benefit every class in the State, and amongst the rest to promote to the utmost the interests of the poor; and this in virtue of his office, and without being open to any suspicion of undue interference—since it is the province of the State to consult the common good. And the more that is done for the benefit of the working classes by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for special means to relieve them.

SHOULD BE SOLICITOUS FOR THE WORKING POPULATION

There is another and deeper consideration which must not be lost sight of. As regards the State, the interests of all, whether high or low, are equal. The poor are members of the national community equally with the

rich; they are real component living members which constitute, through the family, the living body; and it need hardly be said that they are in every State very largely in the majority. It would be irrational to neglect one portion of the citizens and favor another; and therefore the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working classes; otherwise that law of justice will be violated which ordains that each man shall have his due. To cite the wise words of St. Thomas of Aquin: "As the part and the whole are in a certain sense identical, the part may in some sense claim what belongs to the whole."(1) Among the many and grave duties of rulers who would do their best for the people, the first and chief is to act with strict justice—with that justice which is called by the schoolmen *distributive*—towards each and every class alike.

But although all citizens, without exception, can and ought to contribute to that common good in which individuals share so advantageously to themselves, yet it should not be supposed that all can contribute in the like way and to the same extent. No matter what changes may occur in forms of government, there will ever be differences and inequalities of condition in the State. Society cannot exist or be conceived without them. Some there must be who devote themselves to the work of the commonwealth, who make the laws or administer justice, or whose advice and authority govern the nation in times of peace, and defend it in war. Such men clearly occupy the foremost place in the State, and should be held in highest estimation, for their work concerns most

(1) Summa 2a 2ae 61, Art. 1 and 2.

nearly and effectively the general interests of the community. Those who labor at a trade or calling do not promote the general welfare in such measure as this; but they benefit the nation, if less directly, in a most important manner. Still we have insisted that, since the end of Society is to make men better, the chief good that Society can possess is virtue. Nevertheless, in all well-constituted States it is in nowise a matter of small moment to provide those bodily and external commodities *the use of which is necessary to virtuous action.*(1) And in order to provide such material well-being, the labor of the poor—the exercise of their skill, and the employment of their strength, in the culture of the land and in the workshops of trade—is of great account and quite indispensable. Indeed, their cooperation is in this respect so important that it may be truly said that it is only by the labor of workingmen that States grow rich. Justice, therefore, demands that the interests of the poorer classes should be carefully watched over by the administration, so that they who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits which they create—that being housed, clothed, and enabled to sustain life, they may find their existence less hard and more endurable. It follows that whatever shall appear to prove conducive to the well-being of those who work should obtain favorable consideration. Let it not be feared that solicitude of this kind will be harmful to any interest; on the contrary, it will be to the advantage of all; for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to shield from misery those on whom it so largely depends.

(1) De Regimine Principum I, 15.

IN WHAT RESPECTS THE STATE SHOULD INTERFERE

We have said that the State must not absorb the individual or the family; both should be allowed free and untrameled action so far as is consistent with the common good and the interests of others. Rulers should, nevertheless, anxiously safeguard the community and all its members: the community, because the conservation thereof is so emphatically the business of the supreme power that the safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but it is a government's whole reason of existence; and the members, because both philosophy and the Gospel concur in laying down that the object of the government of the State should be not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he is placed. The gift of authority is from God, and is, as it were, a participation in the highest of all sovereignties; and should be exercised as the power of God is exercised —with a fatherly solicitude which not only guides the whole, but reaches also to details.

Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with mischief which can in no other way be met or prevented, the public authority must step in to deal with it. Now, it interests the public as well as the individual, that peace and good order should be maintained; that family life should be carried on in accordance with God's laws and those of nature; that Religion should be reverenced and obeyed; that a high standard of morality should prevail, both in public and private life; that the sanctity of justice should be respected, and that no one should injure another with impunity; that the members of the commonwealth should grow up to man's estate, strong and robust, and capable,

if need be, of guarding and defending their country. If by a strike, or other combination of workmen, there should be imminent danger of disturbance to the public peace; or if circumstances were such as that among the laboring population the ties of family life were relaxed; if Religion were found to suffer through the workmen not having time and opportunity afforded them to practice its duties; if in workshops and factories there were danger to morals through the mixing of the sexes or from other harmful occasions of evil; or if employers laid burdens upon their workmen which were unjust, or degraded them with conditions repugnant to their dignity as human beings; finally, if health were endangered by excessive labor, or by work unsuited to sex or age—in such cases there can be no question but that, within certain limits, it would be right to invoke the aid and authority of the law. The limits must be determined by the nature of the occasion which calls for the law's interference—the principle being that the law must not undertake more, nor proceed further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the mischief.

Rights must be religiously respected wherever they exist; and it is the duty of the public authority to prevent and to punish injury, and to protect every one in the possession of his own. Still, when there is question of defending the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration. The richer class have many ways of shielding themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State; whereas those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly depend upon the assistance of the State. And it is for this reason that wage-earners, who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous,

should be specially cared for and protected by the government.

HOW THE STATE SHOULD DEAL WITH LABOR QUESTIONS

Here, however, it is expedient to bring under special notice certain matters of moment. It should ever be borne in mind that the chief thing to be secured is the safeguarding of private property by legal enactment and public policy. Most of all is it essential amid such a fever of excitement to keep the multitude within the line of duty; for if all may justly strive to better their condition, neither justice nor the common good allows any individual to seize upon that which belongs to another, or, under the futile and shallow pretext of equality, to lay violent hands on other people's possessions. Most true it is that by far the larger part of the workers prefer to better themselves by honest labor rather than by doing any wrong to others. But there are not a few who are imbued with evil principles and eager for revolutionary change, whose main purpose is to stir up tumult and bring about measures of violence. The authority of the State should intervene to put restraint upon such firebrands, to save the working classes from their seditious arts and protect lawful owners from spoliation.

When work-people have recourse to a strike it is frequently because the hours of labor are too long, or the work too hard, or because they consider their wages insufficient. The grave inconvenience of this not uncommon occurrence should be obviated by public remedial measures; for such paralyzing of labor not only affects the masters and their work-people alike, but is extremely injurious to trade and to the general interests of the pub-

lic; moreover, on such occasions violence and disorder are generally not far distant, and thus it frequently happens that the public peace is imperiled. The law should forestall and prevent such troubles from arising; they should lend their influence and authority to the removal in good time of the causes which lead to conflicts between employers and employed.

WORKING PEOPLE MUST HAVE THEIR SPIRITUAL RIGHTS RESPECTED

But if owners of property should be made secure, the workingman, in like manner, has property and belongings in respect to which he should be protected; and foremost of all, his soul and mind. Life on earth, however good and desirable in itself, is not the final purpose for which man is created; it is only the way and the means to that attainment of truth and that practice of goodness in which the full life of the soul consists. It is the soul which is made after the image and likeness of God; it is in the soul that the sovereignty resides in virtue whereof man is commanded to rule the creatures below him and to use all the earth and the ocean for his profit and advantage. *Fill the earth and subdue it; and rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures which move upon the earth.*(1) In this respect all men are equal; there is no difference between rich and poor, master and servant, ruler and ruled, *for the same is Lord over all.*(2) No man may with impunity outrage that human dignity which God Himself treats *with reverence,* nor stand in the way of that higher

(1) Gen. i, 28.
(2) Rom. x, 12.

life which is the preparation for the eternal life of Heaven. Nay, more; no man has in this matter power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, the most sacred and inviolable of rights.

From this follows the obligation of the cessation from work and labor on Sundays and certain holy days. The rest from labor is not to be understood as mere idleness; much less must it be an occasion for spending money and for vicious indulgence, as many would have it to be; but it should be rest from labor, hallowed by religion. Rest (combined with religious observances) disposes man to forget for a while the business of this everyday life, to turn his thoughts to things heavenly, and to the worship which he so strictly owes to the Eternal Godhead. It is this, above all, which is the reason and motive of Sunday rest; a rest sanctioned by God's great law of the Ancient Covenant--*Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day,*(1) and taught to the world by His own mysterious "rest" after the creation of man: *He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done.*(2)

THE STATE AND THE REGULATION OF LABOR

If we turn now to things external and corporeal, the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the

(1) Ex. xx, 8.
(2) Gen. ii, 2.

cruelty of greedy speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments for money-making. It is neither just nor human so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupify their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is developed and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labor, therefore, should be so regulated as not to be protracted over longer hours than strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be must depend on the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workman. Those who work in mines and quarries and extract coal, stone and metals from the bowels of the earth should have shorter hours in proportion as their labor is more severe and trying to health. Then, again, the season of the year should be taken into account; for not unfrequently a kind of labor is easy at one time which at another is intolerable or exceedingly difficult. Finally, work which is quite suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or a child. And, in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently developed. For just as very rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so does too early an experience of life's hard toil blight the young promise of a child's faculties and render any true education impossible. Women, again, are not suited for certain occupations; a woman is by nature fitted for home-work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty and to promote the good bringing-up of children and the well-being of the family. As a

general principle it may be laid down that a workman ought to have leisure and rest proportionate to the wear and tear of his strength; for waste of strength must be repaired by cessation from hard work.

In all agreements between masters and work-people there is always the condition expressed or understood that there should be allowed proper rest for soul and body. To agree, in any other sense, would be against what is right and just; for it can never be just or right to require on the one side or to promise on the other the giving up of those duties which a man owes to his God and to himself.

THE LIVING WAGE

We now approach a subject of great and urgent importance, and one in respect of which, if extremes are to be avoided, right notions are absolutely necessary. Wages, as we are told, are regulated by free consent, and therefore the employer, when he pays what was agreed upon, has done his part, and seemingly is not called upon to do anything beyond. The only way, it is said, in which injustice might occur would be if the master refused to pay the whole of the wages, or if the workman should not complete the work undertaken; in such cases the State should intervene to see that each obtains his due—but not under any other circumstances.

This mode of reasoning is, to the fair-minded man, by no means convincing, for there are important considerations which it leaves out of account altogether. To labor is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and chief of all for self-preservation. *In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat*

thy bread.(1) Hence a man's labor bears two notes or characters. First of all, it is *personal,* inasmuch as the exertion of individual strength belongs to the individual who puts it forth, employing such strength to procure that personal advantage on account of which it was bestowed. Secondly, man's labor is *necessary;* for without the result of labor a man cannot live; and self-preservation is a law of nature which it is wrong to disobey. Now, were we to consider labor so far as it is *personal* merely, doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatsoever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so is he free to accept a small remuneration, or even none at all. But this is a mere abstract supposition; the labor of the workingman is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary;* and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of one and all, and to be wanting therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than through work and wages.

Let it then be taken for granted that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular should agree freely as to the wages; nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, that the remuneration must be sufficient to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort (*alendo opifici, frugi quidem et bene moderato, haud imparem esse mercedem oportere*). If, through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford

(1) Gen. iii, 19.

him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labor in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc.—in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the State, specially as circumstances, times, and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to Societies or Boards, such as We shall mention presently, or to some other mode of safeguarding the interests of the wage-earners; the State being appealed to, should circumstances require, for its sanction and protection.

THE WORKINGMAN SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO ACQUIRE PROPERTY

If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife, and his children in reasonable comfort, he will not find it difficult, if he be a sensible man, to study economy; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by some little savings and thus secure a small income. Nature and reason alike would urge him to this. We have seen that this great Labor question cannot be solved save by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favor ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many as possible of the humbler class to become owners.

Many excellent results will follow from this; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the result of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely differing castes. On the one side there is the party which holds power

because it holds wealth; which has in its grasp the whole of labor and trade; which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is even represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, broken-down and suffering, and ever ready for disturbance. If working-people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the consequence will be that the gulf between vast wealth and sheer poverty will be bridged over, and the respective classes will be brought nearer to one another. A further consequence will result in the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which belongs to them: nay, they learn to love the very soil that yields, in response to the labor of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. That such a spirit of willing labor would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community is self-evident. And a third advantage would spring from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a decent and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can be reckoned on only provided that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is derived from nature, not from man; and the State has the right to control its use in the interests of the public good alone, but by no means to absorb it altogether. The State would therefore be unjust and cruel if under the name of taxation it were to deprive the private owner of more than is fitting.

ASSOCIATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

In the last place—employers and workmen may of themselves effect much in the matter we are treating by means of such associations and organizations as afford opportune aid to those who are in distress, and which draw the two classes more closely together. Among these may be enumerated societies for mutual help; various benevolent foundations established by private persons to provide for the workman and for his widow or his orphans in case of sudden calamity, in sickness, and in the event of death; and what are called "patronages," or institutions for the care of boys and girls, for young people, as well as homes for the aged.

The most important of all are Workingmen's Unions; for these virtually include all the rest. History attests what excellent results were brought about by the Artificers' Guilds of olden times. They were the means of affording not only many advantages to the workmen, but in no small dègree of promoting the advancement of art, as numerous monuments remain to bear witness. Such Unions should be suited to the requirements of this our age—an age of wider education, of different habits, and of far more numerous requirements in daily life. It is gratifying to know that there are actually in existence not a few Associations of this nature, consisting either of workmen alone or of workmen and employers together; but it were greatly to be desired that they should become more numerous and more efficient. We have spoken of them more than once; yet it will be well to explain here how notably they are needed, to show that they exist of their own right, and what should be their organization and their mode of action.

The consciousness of his own weakness urges man to call in aid from without. We read in the pages of Holy Writ: *It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one fall he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up.*(1)

And further: *A brother that is helped by his brother is like a strong city.*(2) It is this natural impulse which binds men together in civil society; and it is likewise this which leads them to join together in associations of citizen with citizen; associations which, it is true, cannot be called societies in the full sense of the word, but which, notwithstanding, are societies.

THE RIGHTS OF ASSOCIATIONS

These lesser societies and the society which constitutes the State differ in many respects, because their immediate purpose and aim is different. Civil society exists for the common good, and hence is concerned with the interests of all in general, albeit with individual interests also in their due place and degree. It is therefore called *public* society, because by its agency, as St. Thomas of Aquin says, "Men establish relations in common with one another in the setting up of a commonwealth."(3). But societies which are formed in the bosom of the State are styled *private,* and rightly so, since their immediate purpose is the private advantage of the associates. "Now a private society," says St. Thomas again, "is one which is formed for the purpose of carrying out private objects; as when two or three enter into partnership with the view

(1) Eccl. iv, 9-10.
(2) Prov. xviii, 19.
(3) Contra impugnates Dei cultum et religionem, 2.

of trading in common."(1) Private societies, then, although they exist within the State, and are severally part of the State, cannot nevertheless be absolutely, and as such, prohibited by the State. For to enter into a "society" of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State is bound to protect natural rights, not to destroy them; and if it forbid its citizens to form associations it contradicts the very principle of its own existence; for both they and it exist in virtue of the like principle, namely, the natural tendency of man to dwell in society.

There are occasions, doubtless, when it is fitting that the law should intervene to prevent association; as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unlawful, or dangerous to the State. In such cases public authority may justly forbid the formation of associations, and may dissolve them if they already exist. But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals and not to impose unreasonable regulations under pretense of public benefit. For laws only bind when they are in accordance with right reason, and hence the eternal law of God.(2)

THE RIGHT OF ECCLESIASTICAL ASSOCIATION

And here we are reminded of the Confraternities, Societies, and Religious Orders which have arisen by the Church's authority and the piety of Christian men. The annals of every nation down to our own days bear witness to what they have accomplished for the human race. It is indisputable that on grounds of reason alone such associations, being perfectly blameless in their objects, pos-

(1) Ibid.
(2) Summa, 1a 2ae Q. 93, Art. 3.

sess the sanction of the law of nature. In their religious aspect they claim rightly to be responsible to the Church alone. The rulers of the State accordingly have no rights over them, nor can they claim any share in their control; on the contrary, it is the duty of the State to respect and cherish them, and, if need be, to defend them from attack. It is notorious that a very different course has been followed, more especially in our own times. In many places the State authorities have laid violent hands on these communities, and committed manifold injustice against them; it has placed them under control of the civil law, taken away their rights as corporate bodies, and despoiled them of their property. In such property the Church had her rights, each member of the body had his or her rights, and there were also the rights of those who had founded or endowed these communities for a definite purpose, and, furthermore, of those for whose benefit and assistance they had their being. Therefore We cannot refrain from complaining of such spoliation as unjust and fraught with evil results; and with all the more reason do we complain because, at the very time when the law proclaims that association is free to all, We see that Catholic Societies, however peaceful and useful, are hampered in every way, whereas the utmost liberty is conceded to individuals whose purposes are at once hurtful to Religion and dangerous to the State.

BAD AND DANGEROUS ASSOCIATIONS

Associations of every kind, and especially those of workingmen, are now far more common than heretofore. As regards many of these there is no need at present to inquire whence they spring, what are their objects, or what the means they employ. There is a good deal of

evidence, however, which goes to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of secret leaders, and are managed on principles ill-according with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their utmost to get within their grasp the whole field of labor, and force workingmen either to join them or to starve. Under these circumstances Christian workingmen must do one of two things: either join associations in which their religion will be exposed to peril, or form Associations among themselves—unite their forces and shake off courageously the yoke of so unrighteous and intolerable an oppression. No one who does not wish to expose man's chief good to extreme risk will for a moment hesitate to say that the second alternative should by all means be adopted.

CATHOLIC ASSOCIATIONS FOR WORKINGMEN TO BE ENCOURAGED

Those Catholics are worthy of all praise—and they are not a few—who, understanding what the times require, have striven by various undertakings and endeavors to better the condition of the working-class without any sacrifice of principle being involved. They have taken up the cause of the workingman, and have spared no efforts to better the condition both of families and individuals; to infuse a spirit of equity into the mutual relations of employers and employed; to keep before the eyes of both classes the precepts of duty and the laws of the Gospel—that Gospel which, by inculcating self-restraint, keeps men within the bounds of moderation and tends to establish harmony among the divergent interests and the various classes which compose the State. It is with such ends in view that we see men of eminence

meeting together for discussion, for the promotion of concerted action, and for practical work. Others, again, strive to unite workingmen of various grades into Associations, help them with their advice and means, and enable them to obtain fitting and profitable employment. The Bishops, on their part, bestow their ready good-will and support; and, with their approval and guidance, many members of the clergy, both secular and regular, labor assiduously in behalf of the spiritual and mental interests of the members of such Associations. And there are not wanting Catholics blessed with affluence who have, as it were, cast in their lot with the wage-earners, and who have spent large sums in founding and widely spreading Benefit and Insurance Societies, by means of which the workingman may without difficulty acquire through his labor not only many present advantages, but also the certainty of honorable support in days to come. How greatly such manifold and earnest activity has benefited the community at large is too well known to require Us to dwell upon it. We find therein grounds for most cheering hope in the future, provided always that the Asociations We have described continue to grow and spread, and are well and wisely administered. Let the State watch over these Societies of citizens banded together for the exercise of their rights; but let it not thrust itself into their peculiar concerns and their organization; for things move and live by the spirit inspiring them, and may be killed by the rough grasp of a hand from without.

ADVICE TO CATHOLIC ASSOCIATIONS

In order, then, that an Asociation may be carried on with unity of purpose and harmony of action, its or-

ganization and government should be firm and wise. All such Societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such rules and organizations as may best conduce to the attainment of their respective objects. We do not judge it expedient to enter into minute particulars touching the subject of organization: this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and aim of the work to be done, on the scope of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time:—all of which should be carefully considered.

To sum up, then, We may lay it down as a general and lasting law that workingmen's Associations should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at, that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind and property. It is clear that they must pay special and chief attention to the duties of religion and morality, and that their internal discipline must be guided very strictly by these weighty considerations; otherwise they would lose wholly their special character, and end by becoming little better than those societies which take no account whatever of Religion. What advantage can it be to a workingman to obtain by means of a Society all that he requires and to endanger his soul for lack of spiritual food? *What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?* (1) This, as Our Lord teaches, is the mark or character that distinguishes the Christian from the heathen. *After all these things do the heathens seek. . . . Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and*

(1) Matt. xvi, 26.

His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you.(1) Let our Associations, then, look first and before all things to God; let religious instruction have therein the foremost place, each one being carefully taught what is his duty to God, what he has to believe, what to hope for, and how he is to work out his salvation; and let all be warned and strengthened with special care against wrong principles and false teaching. Let the workingman be urged and led to the worship of God, to the earnest practice of religion, and, among other things, to the keeping holy of Sundays and holydays. Let him learn to reverence and love Holy Church, the common Mother of us all; and hence to obey the precepts of the Church, and to frequent the Sacraments, since they are the means ordained by God for obtaining forgiveness of sin and for leading a holy life.

The foundations of the organizations being thus laid in Religion, We next proceed to make clear the relation of the members one to another, in order that they may live together in concord and go forward prosperously and with good results. The offices and charges of the Society should be apportioned for the good of the Society itself, and in such mode that difference in degree or standing should not interfere with unanimity and good-will. Office-bearers should be appointed with due prudence and discretion, and each one's charge should be carefully mapped out. Hereby no member will suffer injury. Let the common funds be administered with strict honesty, in such mode that a member may receive assistance in proportion to his necessities. The rights and duties of the employers, as compared with the rights

(1) Matt. vi, 32-33.

and duties of the employed, ought to be the subject of careful consideration. Should it happen that either a master or a workman believe himself injured, nothing would be more desirable than that a committee should be appointed composed of reliable and capable members of the Association, whose duty would be, conformably with the rules of the Association, to settle the dispute. Among the several purposes of a Society one should be to try to arrange for a continuous supply of work at all times and seasons; as well as to create a fund out of which the members may be effectually helped in their needs, not only in cases of accident, but also in sickness, old age, and distress.

Such rules and regulations, if willingly obeyed by all, will sufficiently insure the well-being of the poor; whilst such Mutual Associations among Catholics are certain to be productive in no small degree of prosperity to the State. It is not rash to conjecture the future from the past. Age gives way to age, but the events of one century are wonderfully like those of another; for they are directed by the Providence of God, Who overrules the course of history in accordance with His purposes in creating the race of man. We are told that it was cast as a reproach on the Christians in the early ages of the Church that the greater number among them had to live by begging or by labor. Yet, destitute though they were of wealth and influence, they ended by winning over to their side the favor of the rich and the good-will of the powerful. They showed themselves, industrious, hard-working, assiduous, and peaceful, ruled by justice, and, above all, bound together in brotherly love. In presence of such mode of life and such example, prejudice gave way, the tongue of malevolence was silenced, and the

lying legends of ancient superstition little by little yielded to Christian truth.

At the time being the condition of the working classes is the pressing question of the hour, and nothing can be of higher interest to all classes of the State than that it should be rightly and reasonably adjusted. But it will be easy for Christian workingmen to decide it aright if they will form Associations, choose wise guides, and follow on the path which with so much advantage to themselves and the common weal was trodden by their fathers before them. Prejudice, it is true, is mighty, and so is the greed of money; but if the sense of what is just and rightful be not debased through depravity of heart, their fellow citizens are sure to be won over to a kindly feeling towards men whom they see to be in earnest as regards their work and who prefer so unmistakably right dealing to mere lucre and the sacredness of duty to every other consideration.

And further great advantage would result from the state of things We are describing; there would exist so much more ground for hope, and likelihood even, of recalling to a sense of their duty those workingmen who have either given up their faith altogether or whose lives are at variance with its precepts. Such men feel in most cases that they have been fooled by empty promises and deceived by false pretexts. They cannot but perceive that their grasping employers too often treat them with great inhumanity and hardly care for them outside the profit their labor brings; and if they belong to any Union, it is probably one in which there exists, instead of charity and love, that intestine strife which ever accompanies poverty when unresigned and unsustained by religion. Broken in spirit and worn down in body, how many of

them would gladly free themselves from such galling bondage! But human respect, or the dread of starvation makes them tremble to take the step. To such as these Catholic Associations are of incalculable service, by helping them out of their difficulties, inviting them to companionship, and receiving the returning wanderers to a haven where they may securely find repose.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS; DIVINE CHARITY

We have now laid before you, Venerable Brethren, both who are the persons and what are the means whereby this most arduous question must be solved. Every one should put his hand to the work which falls to his share, and that at once and straightway, lest the evil which is already so great become through delay absolutely beyond remedy. Those who rule the State should make use of the laws and institutions of the country; masters and wealthy owners must be mindful of their duty; the poor, whose interests are at stake, should make every lawful and proper effort; and since religion alone, as We said at the beginning, can avail to destroy the evil at its root, all men should rest persuaded that the main thing needful is to return to real Christianity, apart from which all the plans and devices of the wisest will prove of little avail.

In regard to the Church, her cooperation will never be found lacking, be the time or the occasion what it may; and she will intervene with all the greater effect in proportion as her liberty of action is the more unfettered. Let this be carefully taken to heart by those whose office it is to safeguard the public welfare. Every minister of holy religion must bring to the struggle the full energy

of his mind and all his power of endurance. Moved by your authority, Venerable Brethren, and quickened by your example, they should never cease to urge upon men of every class, upon the high-placed as well as the lowly, the Gospel doctrines of Christian life; by every means in their power they must strive to secure the good of the people, and, above all, must earnestly cherish in themselves, and try to arouse in others, charity, the mistress and the queen of virtues. For the happy results we all long for must be chiefly brought about by the plenteous outpouring of charity; of that true Christian charity which is the fulfilling of the whole Gospel law, which is always ready to sacrifice itself for others' sake, and is man's surest antidote against worldly pride and immoderate love of self; that charity whose office is described and whose Godlike features are outlined by the Apostle St. Paul in these words: *Charity is patient, is kind, . . . seeketh not her own, . . . Suffereth all things, . . . endureth all things.*(1)

On each one of you, Venerable Brothers, and on your Clergy and people, as an earnest of God's mercy and a mark of Our affection, We, lovingly in the Lord, bestow the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, the fifteenth day of May, 1891. LEO XIII, Pope.

(1) I Cor. xiii, 4 and 7.

The Genesis of Socialism

The spectre of Socialism, which looms over modern civilization with a menace of ruin, may well cause serious alarm. How it was formed; how it grew to its present proportions; what dangers it entails, are questions of the most vital and immediate interest to all manner of men.

In general its rise may be ascribed to the elimination of Christianity from modern legislation; to the influence of false economic principles; and to the new methods which the nations have adopted to achieve greatness and power.

In political matters the disturbing element is undoubtedly the theory which dominates the civilized world today with regard to the origin of civil power, viz., that its source is the people; that the people have conferred it, and can revoke it at pleasure.

It is the doctrine of J. J. Rousseau, who described it as the Social Compact which was entered into by the aboriginal peoples and their rulers; a fiction which has been for more than a century regarded as an unquestioned and sacred fact, but which is without the slightest historical foundation. Needless to say, it is in direct contradiction with Catholic teaching, which proclaims, with St. Paul, that all authority is from God, and though it may, and often does, come through the people, it does not originate there, and in no case confers unlimited right to rebel.

The uninterrupted series of national upheavals, beginning with the French Revolution, which have disturbed

the world since the promulgation of Rousseau's theory, the startling and ever increasing number of assassinations of rulers, and the impunity with which any one can plan the overthrow of existing institutions show how strong a hold this doctrine has taken on the public mind. Rousseau's Social Compact is the Socialist's Magna Charta.

The theory is sometimes expressed in the formula that "all government is based on the consent of the governed," which is equally untenable. Consent is certainly not required for a father to govern his children, nor for God to govern His creatures. Nor is it true of civil government. The police force, the prisons, the scaffolds, the electric chairs are so many denials of such a pretense. In one sense it may be true, viz., that when the people recognize that the will of the ruler is not the unwarranted, unauthorized and baseless claim of an individual who in one way or another has achieved power, but is the concrete expression of the will of the Supreme Ruler of the universe, Who decrees that all governments should proceed along the lines of right and justice, then they willingly consent to be governed; but such consent is the assurance of peace, and not the foundation of any right to rule.

While this philosophical delusion was misleading the public policy of nations an economic transformation was taking place in almost every civilized country. That change is commonly described as The Great Industrial Revolution, inaugurated about one hundred and fifty years ago, through the instrumentality of machinery and the newly discovered forces in nature, which effected a sudden and stupendous expansion of manufacturing industries and a concomitant extension of trade, and

brought about the displacement, the rearrangement, and in some instances, especially in the beginning, the degradation and the enslavement of whole sections of the working populations of the world.

It is an error, however, to imagine that there were no great industrial aggregations prior to the nineteenth century. Taking France as an instance, there were in the eighteenth century as many as 10,000 cloth-makers in the district of Givonnes alone; the ribbon industry of St. Etienne and St. Chamond employed 26,000 people in 1755; and in 1760 around Rouen 45,000 people were working for twelve employers. This fact will be properly appreciated when we learn that in a great industrial centre like Worcester, Mass., there are only 25,595 employed in the manufactories, and that those establishments run up beyond a thousand in number. The difference between then and now is that in former times the factory system was unknown, and there was not a distinct class described as the workingmen, nor were they distinguished by that other odious appellation, the proletariat. Many of the old operatives were government employees, engaged in the royal monopolies; in other establishments the master was himself a workingman, on the same social level as his men; and the peasants also were engaged at these industries in their homes. But when the Government withdrew, individual competition began, vast capital was accumulated in the hands of a few, and the managers of these enterprises became controlling factors in the affairs of the nation.

More than that. The political importance which they acquired, both by their ever-growing riches and the vast numbers of people whom they influenced or controlled, profoundly modified that section of society which had

been so far regarded as the dominant class, viz., the aristocracy. Wealthy plebeians were prompted almost as a matter of business to purchase a place among the nobles; not a difficult thing, because the stigma which attached to trade had long been removed; even princes not disdaining to profit by commercial speculations. Impecunious noblemen also, whom the centralizing character of most governments had long debarred from the administration of public affairs, welcomed such accessions to their families. The consequence was that to the aristocracy of birth succeeded the aristocracy of wealth, with the same arrogance and aloofness, but without the same Christianity. Hence a deeper and broader line of demarcation and antagonism between the new lords, anxious to assert their superiority, and the classes which they sprung from and which they endeavored to forget. In view of the coming battle this was a serious calamity, which grew more grave as Christianity lost its hold on both parties. Even where affiliation with the upper classes was not effected, the old division of gentle and simple completely disappeared, and between the favorites of progress and the victims of poverty a wide cleavage was made.

A French observer of English conditions finds that "the practical Englishman, the successful business man, who is proud to be a merchant and nothing else, has risen to great social and political prominence. He usurps the old traditions and privileges of the class above, and exploits in an unexampled manner the lives and energy of all beneath. For him the rationalist philosophers, the utilitarian moralists, the official economists of the mercantile school are in the place of a spiritual hierarchy; a kind of priestly class. Himself the issue of certain facts

and certain changes, he has on his side whatever there is of intellectual authority in England."

In America, where nobility of birth is unknown, the ideal man is admittedly the successful business speculater, the daring financier, the captain of industry. "Over our plains," says a recent writer, "the Genius of Industry ranges unchallenged, naked and unashamed," and President Cleveland lately felt called upon to say that: "No one can be so blind as not to see that in our growing and consuming madness in the pursuit of wealth, with its consequent indifference to political duty, there is a danger that our social and industrial equality will be destroyed, and our political independence made the sport of demagogues."

As long ago as 1879 no less a personage than the Czar of Russia said of us: "Your great industrial development has built up very large fortunes in few hands, and the conditions such fortunes produce must bring on a class conflict that cannot fail to make a test of the stability of your instiutions. The men who have those fortunes know only the law of greed; they have no respect for the rights of others, and they will surely make an effort to use the strong arm of government to enslave the people. They will use the public franchises you grant with so liberal and so dangerous a hand to tax the people. They will organize into groups to increase their power, and their aggressions will as surely drive the body of your people to the enactment of laws which may be most hurtful to the general prosperity. I see a great conflict which must soon come in America between the few who have vast fortunes and the many reduced to a kind of industrial slavery." (*Independent*, March 24, 1904.)

That commerce should preponderate in determining

the policies of the nation was inevitable. As early as 1776 we hear Seguier remonstrating with Louis XVI that: "Corporations are a chain whose first link is connected with the authority of the throne, and it would be perilous to break it. The mere idea of doing so should fill us with terror; it would mean the reconstruction of the whole political edifice from top to bottom."

This is much truer now. Acquisition of power through commercial success is almost the exclusive aim of the great nations and the great men of our times, and industrialism of every kind has made itself the dominant spirit of the age. It affects the decisions of statesmen; it shapes the policies of governments; it dictates treaties of peace and declarations of war; it compels the establishment of standing armies and the building of monstrous fleets to protect and promote the interests of trade all over the world; it imposes enormous burdens of taxation, which fall heaviest on the poor; it multiplies, indeed, the wealth of nations, but it increases the opportunities for personal and political corruption; and it is now absolutely without control, for its cardinal tenet is that religious principles have no concern in the business enterprises and world-politics of to-day. No wonder that thinking men are filled with alarm.

Besides establishing this new and powerful class of moneyed magnates, the needs of commerce and industry naturally led to the centralization of manufactures in one place; the facilities for cheaper and quicker production and distribution rendering it imperative.

Two results followed. First, the destruction of the peasant class. Machinery, as well as the discoveries of the new science of chemistry, had the effect of making a large agricultural population superfluous; while at the

same time the gigantic scale on which modern farming began to be conducted transformed the former peasant proprietors into employees. We are familiar with this; but the *Revue de Paris* tells us that this change is now taking place even in France, where the small landowner was hitherto considered the principal strength of the nation. The second result was the aggregation of vast multitudes within the walls of factories and at the mouths of pits, in conditions which, especially in the beginning, were a disgrace to civilization. These displaced millions were valued mainly for their power to increase the wealth of their masters, and, as some one has said, were "a regimented and rightless proletariat as truly as were the ancient toilers of Egypt."

It is true that certain economists find the condition of this class to be much better than it was before trade had brought about these changes. Thus Rae, in his "Contemporary Socialism," informs us that in 1668 the average income of a working family in England was £12 12s. and is now £81; that 74 per cent. of the population were then breadwinners and earned 26 per cent. of the income of the whole country; whereas, in 1867, 80 per cent. were breadwinners and earned 40 per cent. of the income of the country. According to Mulhall, seventy-five years ago the workman toiled 90 to 100 hours a week, but now only 56½, while wages have increased 12 and, in some cases, 40 per cent. Carroll D. Wright says that wages rose from $100 a year in 1850 for 70 hours a week to $250 in 1880 for 60 hours, and he finds factory life much better for light, air and sanitation than in the old system of domestic manufacture.

Other students of the question, however, take different views, and call attention to the fact that while the labor-

ing man receives absolutely more pay for his work, yet his poverty is much more acute by contrast. His clothes, though cheaper, are generally the result of sweating, which itself is oppression of the workingman; they are quickly destroyed by the atmosphere in which the laborer lives and the work he is engaged in. Devas calculates that English workmen waste millions every year in this fashion. The food he eats, though cheaper and more varied, is frequently adulterated and unwholesome; the dwellings he occupies sometimes consume twenty per cent. of his income, and are so indecently crowded as to be notoriously and shamefully prejudicial to health and morality; the air he breathes at his work is often poisonous; the smoke and soot that hang over the great industrial centres deprive him of the light of the sun, and defile everything with grime; the pollution of every running stream, which modern industry universally and stupidly converts into a sewer, makes even water hard to procure; even if not crippled at his work, the workman is liable to be laid off when still young, forty being in some instances the time limit; when maimed or killed there is little or no provision for his helpless family, and such a contingency is not remote, for Mulhall puts the figure of those who are killed in Great Britain at 18,000 a year, while we in the United States run up to 30,000, the mines being mainly responsible; and in any event, the future has little hope for the discontented toiler who reads that in England and Wales, according to the official accounts, there are nearly 400,000 dependent paupers, not to speak of the multitudes that are living from hand to mouth.

Which of these conflicting testimonies is true matters little. The fact is that the workingman of to-day, whether better off or not, is ploughed with discontent,

although factory legislation has remedied many of the original abuses and private philanthropy has been busy in ameliorating his condition. He recognizes that he is a new factor in the world. He knows that he is not the serf that he was one hundred and fifty years ago, when any kind of labor was a badge of slavery and when the police were ordered to exert special vigilance on the working classes as being naturally prone to disorder. Even the revolution of '89, which he wrongly regards as the first step in his emancipation, used all the power of the State against him. Napoleon in his turn gave the laboring classes no consideration whatever. On the other side of the Channel the condition of Sir Robert Peel's English operatives in 1802 in some respects surpassed the horrors of African slavery. Yet he himself was a master manufacturer, to whom the new system of labor had brought wealth and power and station. The attitude of the government toward the workers may be realized by the fact that Peel was unable to get an act passed in Parliament "for the preservation of the health and morality of apprentices and others employed in cotton factories." During the bourgeois régime in France from 1815 to 1849 they counted for naught, and it was only under Napoleon III, who boasted of being a Socialist, that they were allowed the right to assemble, to state their grievances, and ultimately to vote when universal suffrage was accorded.

Since then the laborer has been transformed mentally, morally, socially. He is now one of an organized body, a distinct class in society, and in close union not only with men of his own trade and country, but with those of every other country, and absolutely separated from and antagonistic to those who employ him. The use of

machinery has not degraded him. On the contrary, it has made him more intelligent, and his increased technological and professional education is continually quickening his perceptions, which began to be trained in the primary schools and are kept on the alert by evening classes, lectures, reading, etc. He reads and he thinks, both badly at times, it is true, but he does both. Moreover, he has been taught from childhood that he is every man's equal, and demagogues and a part of the press, especially his own, din into his ears that he is defrauded of his patrimony; that he has a right to his share in the wealth which he sees eevrywhere lavished in all sorts of criminal indulgence; that governments are corrupt, and are in the hands of the moneyed classes; that, because of the ballot, he is the controlling political factor in the world; that a mighty change is coming, of which he will reap the first and greatest benefit, and that he has only to organize and wait for the signal to be given.

Unfortunately, while all this was going on, the religious spirit of the world deteriorated. The principle of the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, which authorized every one to be his own judge in the matter of religion, developed in the eighteenth century into the teachings of Rationalism and Materialism; the former doing away with the supernatural, while the latter denied that a man had a soul and a hereafter. Both doctrines descended naturally into the degrading Evolution of to-day, which is regarded as especially Socialistic and which teaches that the crimes of men and nations are only the phenomena of great foreordained cosmic changes, over which man has no control, and so does away with the moral law.

These doctrines, accepted as the gospel of what are

called the educated classes of to-day, have by means of innumerable essays, romances, public conferences, and editorials filtered down into the minds of the modern workingmen. Finally, for the greater part of them, Christianity is not merely a dead issue, but is treated with scorn and contempt, every effort being made by their instructors to render it ridiculous and offensive. Churchmen are hypocrites and moneygetters; Christ is no better than Buddha or Confucius or Mahomet, and if God exists He is a tyrant and a monster.

Out of these conditions in the ethical, political, religious, domestic and commercial world Socialism arose.

It presents itself under various aspects and with apparently different objects, but all tending remotely or immediately to one end, viz., the change or overthrow of all existing governments. They may be classified as follows:

1. Social Democracy or Collectivism, which demands the appropriation and administration by the State of all capital and instruments of labor. This is claimed by its adherents as the only genuine form of Socialism.

2. Positive Communism, which enlarges on Collectivism and aims at the transfer of all goods to one administration, permitting the use of some things, however, as private property.

3. Moderate Positive Communism, which, like Collectivism, advocates only the withdrawal of capital and instruments of labor from private hands, to be administered, however, not by the State, but by labor organizations.

4. Negative Communism, which calls for the abolition of all private property.

5. Scientific Anarchy, which does not desire violent

measures, at least for the present. It is supposedly academic as yet and teaches that the management of Capital and Labor should be put, not in the hands of the State or of the Labor Unions, but in the control of Communes, which are to be independent of any central government, as were the ancient Greek republics.

6. Anarchy proper, which calls for the immediate use of fire and sword.

7. Agrarian Socialism, which demands the confiscation of land.

8. Socialism of the Chair, which advocates merely an increase of government paternalism.

The propagation of these various theories began with Saint Simon (1776-1825), who first projected the idea in the world that labor is the source of all value, but he urged nothing practical. The Scotchman, Adam Smith, in the preceding century, had set down labor as one of the sources of wealth, but not the only one. Fourrier (1772-1837) first urged the organization of labor. Each proprietor was to contribute all his wealth to a common fund, so that every one might follow that particular occupation for which he felt an attraction; but the forcible abolition of private property was not suggested. Louis Blanc (1811-1882) found the evils of the day originated in private competition, and wanted the State to be the chief producer, so as to make private enterprise impossible. Karl Rodbertus, in Germany (1805-1875), pleaded for the abolition of real estate and capital, as private possessions. Next came Karl Marx, the greatest of all Socialist writers and leaders. In his work entitled "Capital" he maintained that labor is the only source of exchange-value, and that the surplus above that, which now goes to the capitalist, should be contributed to a

common fund. Marx is the founder of the International, or the union of labor associations of all nations. Associated with him was Lassalle (1825-1864), whose Workingman's Programme, delivered at the Berlin Workingman's Club, is called The Wittenberg Thesis of Socialism, alluding, of course, to Luther's declaration at the time of the Reformation. He is famous for his theory of the Iron Law of Wages, which even Bishop Ketteler adopted, but which the Trades Unions, by pushing up the scale of wages as they wished, have shown to be false. Bebel and Liebknecht are the most prominent Socialists to-day, the former of whom was originally a bitter opponent of the movement. The Russians, Bakounin and Krapotkin, are the chief apostles of anarchy, the former having propagated it in Italy, in spite of Mazzini. There are others distinguished in the movement, like Karl Marlo, Engles, Babœuf, Ferri, Bernstein; but these will suffice.

What gives significance to it is that the doctrine is preached by representatives of every class of society. Saint Simon was a noble, Babœuf a plebeian, Bakounin and Krapotkin princes; and, what is very remarkable, according to Gualtieri, whose treatise on Socialism is the most scholarly and comprehensive work yet published, the chief apostles of Socialism in Italy are the middle class, or bourgeoisie, whose existence, above all others, is threatened. "Socialism," he says, "is not produced spontaneously in the lower strata of society, it is not the natural fruit of the sufferings of the lowly, and of the tyranny and oppression of the rich, but is propagated and fomented among the ignorant masses by members of the middle class, who have never felt these sufferings nor undergone this oppression. Various motives impel

them to take part in this agitation. In some it is a real desire to mitigate the hardships of the poor, in others it is envy of those higher placed than themselves, and the desire to secure their own elevation by the overthrow of the existing order. The seed is nearly always laid in the schools by teachers who abuse their office to inculcate their political principles. Numbers of masters and professors, in primary and secondary schools as well as in the universities, preach Socialism and hold the most subversive doctrines, which they proclaim openly from the chair or platform" (*Tablet,* March 5, 1904). On the other hand, in France the bourgeoisie, which now includes all property owners, are considered to be the chief enemy of the Socialists, though the bourgeoisie proper were really the cause of the French Revolution. De Mun fancies that the strong religious feeling of this class gives hope for the future, while Bodley considers that their opposition to the collectivist theories of the Socialist is a remnant of their old Individualistic doctrines of 1789. In Germany the greatest men in the movement, Marx and Lassalle, were Jews. Hegel, who formulated the pantheistic religion of Socialism, and is considered, so to say, its high-priest, was originally intended for the ministry. In Denmark women are its most ardent propagandists. In Holland the leader is an ex-Lutheran minister, and in Belgium a millionaire.

The movement has made its greatest progress in Germany, because property and comfort are badly distributed there, and because its doctrines have been scientifically studied. Even when Bismarck resorted to repressive measures, after the attempt to assassinate the old emperor, there were 155 Socialist newspapers in the Empire. The Socialist vote fell off 30 per cent., but now they

have 81 representatives in Parliament, and Bebel, the leader, is said to control 3,000,000 votes. However, it is not sure that the wonderful increase in the last election was altogether due to sympathy with the party. Bebel maintains that the army is honeycombed with Socialism, which, considering the harsh treatment meted out to the rank and file, is not to be wondered at. Over-education is responsible also to some extent. Thirty-one per cent. of the physicians of Berlin, it is said, earn only $750 a year, and all the professions are overcrowded. It is evident that there is room there for discontent.

In France, for the last six years, the government has been controlled by the Socialists, and Jaurès, their leader, boasts that it cannot exist without them. Their representatives in the Ministry are men like Millerand and Pelletan, and in the Chambers their cause is advocated by most eloquent speakers, like Villani and others. The great cities are the chief centres of the movement, the peasantry having no liking for a party which proclaims the destruction of peasant proprietorship; but that preservative element is now being eliminated.

It is not strong with the Magyars, who are generally in comfortable circumstances, though it is said to control 1,000,000 votes in Austria. On the other hand, the Poles, although poor, are not enthusiastic about the movement. If they declare for it, hatred of Germany and Russia prompts them. The Czechs of Bohemia are not ardent for it, but the Italians are. Bakounin, the Russian anarchist, introduced it there, but the anarchist feature has faded somewhat; and politics are resorted to for its advancement, as well as the infamous journals like the *Avanti* and the *Asino*, which are scattered broadcast to discredit religion and corrupt the people. The universal

distress in the three classes of Italian society facilitates the work of propagating it; but Lavelyé very curiously says it can never make much headway there, because there is no metropolis which can be made a centre of agitation. "The malaria which makes Rome uninhabitable for the greater part of the year will long preserve her from the horrors of a Commune." It is physical against moral disease.

As far back as 1873 there were already 300,000 Socialists in Spain; but the party is rent with divisions. Singularly enough, the peasants are more socialistic and communistic than the workingmen, the reason being that they dislike a general government and cling to their old forms of communal administration. In fact, the workingmen were, at least some time ago, strongly against the movement.

In Portugal Socialism does not prosper. Switzerland is swarming with foreign Socialists, but the Swiss themselves do not favor the movement, possibly because most of their Cantons have long adopted many of the Collectivist ideas in their methods of government. England is the hope and despair of the Continental Socialists. Everything is ready for a revolution, but the people will not rise, and Marx said that any proletariate movement in which England is not a factor is like a storm in a glass of water. Belgium, on account of its manufactures, seems well adapted to the work, but it has not thriven there. Lavelyé attributes the ill-success to free discussion. It is rather due to the sturdy Catholicity of the country. But the most remarkable of all is there is no Socialism in Ireland, although it seems a miracle for a country seething for centuries with economic and political discontent to escape such a visitation.

The most serious feature of Socialism is that it has or is a religion. Like all aggregations of men, it cannot get along without it. Witness Freemasonry, with its rites and symbols, its ceremonies, its dogmas, its altars, its priesthood. Socialism has its religious tenets, and is not merely a philanthropic movement or a political platform. If that were understood, many who support it now would abjure it absolutely. As a matter of fact, you can scarcely take up a Socialist book that attempts to treat the matter scientifically without finding some reference, directly or indirectly, to the teachings of the German pantheist Hegel, who formulated its dogmas and is considered its prophet and high priest. Like all false religions, it develops a fanaticism which it cannot control.

Hegel taught that religion, like all else, follows the law of evolution. It began with the beliefs of the Orient; they gave way in turn to the religions of Greece and Rome, which subsequently succumbed to Christianity. It is time now for Christianity to be supplanted by the worship of Humanity, which is the true divinity. We are all parts of that divinity, and our individual relations to it constitute the code of ethics of the modern world.

Reducing this theory to a practical working programme, Marx, in his "Secret Societies in Switzerland," writes: "We wage war against all prevailing ideas about religion. The idea of God is the keystone of a perverted civilization, and it is needful to sweep it from the face of the earth."

"God and humanity," says Prudhon in his "Confessions d' un revolutionaire," "are two irreconcilable enemies, and the first duty of an enlightened man is to drive away mercilessly the idea of God from the mind and the conscience. Atheism ought to be the law of morals and of

the intelligence; the atheism of Spinoza and of Hegel; atheism, in brief, which is idealism raised to its highest power." In the French Chambers, Villani, the most pronounced Socialist orator, proclaimed that the fight against the Congregations was not against clericalism, nor Catholicism, nor Christianity, but against all religion. And Buisson, one of the chief officials in the Ministry of Education, thus expresses himself: "In all the story about God and the world which Catholic dogma presents there is not one single word which does not provoke, I will not say indignation, for in order to be indignant one would have to believe, but a mute and melancholy denial. The only possible result of all rational education must be the evolution of the religion of the past into the irreligion of the future." Not to quote further, "the triumph of the Galilean," says Senator Delpech, "has lasted long enough. It is now His time to die."

From all this several very disastrous consequences ensue. First, as regards the individual.

If it be true that man is part of the divinity, then he is absolutely his own master; he is a law unto himself (an error, let it be noted, that is admitted by multitudes outside the Socialist ranks); he is not only not to be condemned, but commended, for satisfying all his natural wants and desires; and on the same ground, if he is one of the disinherited of fortune, he admits as an axiom the Socialist doctrine that all property is theft. In brief, this pantheistic doctrine befogs the mind with a pernicious delusion, which is itself a calamity, perverts the will and makes the baser passions of men dominate, while it authorizes and applauds robbery and murder.

Secondly. It aims at the destruction of the family.

The fundamental doctrine of this new movement is

that there can be no human or divine legislation with regard to the institution of marriage; that human passion is the only guide as to its duration; that promiscuity of intercourse is the ideal condition; that children belong to the State; that mothers should, according to Bebel, bring them forth in State institutions, and then be free to contract whatever other alliance may suit their fancy. For the furtherance of this end, Free Love Communities should be established where it is possible, and, where it is not, divorce laws should be enacted of such a nature as to bring about the same result.

Thirdly. It not only inculcates individual and domestic anarchy, but it professedly aims at the ruin of all existing governments. Thus Marx, in his "Secret Societies in Switzerland," says: "We content ourselves at present with laying the foundations of revolutions, and shall have deserved well when we shall have excited hatred and contempt for all existing institutions. We wage war against all prevailing ideas about religion, state, country, patriotism."

Liebknecht, his lieutenant, candidly explains the different methods to be adopted: "A general ought to change his tactics according to the movements of the enemy. Were we living in Russia we should adopt the tactics of the Nihilist. We should employ all the means which the modern State affords to turn people against it."

The Socialist party, which met in Cincinnati as far back as 1885, besides declaring for government ownership of railroads, canals, ferries, gas, telephone, telegraphs, etc., insisting on recalling of all land grants, the furnishing of meals, clothing, etc., to children, and the granting of divorce on mutual consent, calls for the abolition of the Senate and Vice-Presidency of the United

States. All these demands are justified if the source of authority is the people, and if they have a right to revoke it at pleasure.

To expedite this work of destruction of existing governments, Marx founded his International Society, which unites the Socialists of every country in one body, irrespective of nationality, and thus secures their cooperation in all the vast network of schemes for the control of education, for enforcing laws of divorce, for the enslavement or extirpation of Christianity, the removal of national frontiers, the dissolution of the national armies—in a word, for a complete and universal social and political revolution.

In France, where Socialism is most successful, there is no concealment of the purpose to do away absolutely with love of country, beginning with destroying it in the hearts of the children. While we are reverencing our flag and floating it from every school house, school teachers there can denounce the national banner as an old rag or an old petticoat; the *Review of Primary Instruction* can tell its readers that if the Government ever attempts to recover Alsace and Lorraine the people ought to establish the Commune to prevent that result; schoolbooks applaud or excuse the assassination of President Carnot, and when these acts are brought before the Chambers one of the Ministers of Education is found to defend the criminals and no word of condemnation is uttered even by the Prime Minister, Combes. Thus the work goes on. Mazzini, in Italy, was once considered a patriot; now he is a belated idealist; and the society which the National Socialists of Germany organized as a check on the International has completely collapsed.

Nor do they propose to leave the accomplishment of

their work to a remote future. For although there is a Revolutionary and an Evolutionary Socialism, and although a professor of the Union Theological Seminary of New York assures the readers of the *North American Review* (June, 1904) that a resolution of the Evolutionary Section was recently carried which declared that "in the modern democratic State the conquest of the public powers by the proletariate cannot be the result of a *coup de main,* but the gradual conquest of municipalities and legislative assemblies," yet apart from the fact that this applies only to democratic and not to other countries, and that "the resolution caused heated discussion ever since," and that "the very author of the resolution himself believes in a final revolution," the recent Socialist Congress in Italy, held about the time that Loubet was hobnobbing with Victor Emmanuel, could scarcely control the partisans of immediate and violent action.

Finally, it is absolutely destructive of all human liberty. We need no better proof of that than to glance at what is going on in France, whose government the Socialists boast of controlling. What is the position of every Frenchman living there to-day? He has no liberty to write, he has no liberty to speak, he has no liberty to pray, he has no liberty to devote himself to good works, he has no liberty to enter a church or to allow any one belonging to him to do so; he has no liberty to teach virtue to his children, or even to educate them in secular matters; he has no liberty to think differently from his rulers, and if he is suspected of doing so he has no liberty to own an inch of property or to draw breath in his native land; and if he goes elsewhere it is only to be a victim of the International, who interpellate their

respective governments about the expulsion of those who were not allowed to live in their own country only because they are virtuous, and for being so are regarded as rebels and enemies. "Absolute subservience in body and soul in those who teach," according to Jaurès, the leading Socialist, "is the basis on which the present government of France is built."

Thus liberty, family, governments, country, all are menaced by this new power that has arisen in almost every country in the world.

What is to be the issue of all this? One of three things: Universal anarchy, the advent of some military leviathan, or the intervention of a third power to avert both calamities.

Even if anarchy were not proclaimed as the purpose of these movements, any one may see that such must be the result.

Collectivism and all its subsidiary and derivative schemes make for that end. They begin by trampling on property rights, which all men, even Socialists, will fight for. That is, in fact, what they are fighting for now. Secondly, the movement in all its phases increases the powers of governments by giving them control over every element of human life. That means the increase of human slavery. The old royal monopolies, which could put men at whatever trade might suit the government, taught that lesson, as did Italy in modern times, when it turned its employees into soldiers to shoot down the strikers. Thirdly, Socialism multiplies opportunities for political corruption, which, as every one knows, is far enough advanced at present. It is idle to plead the economy and more general comfort which Collectivism would effect. Like "the two dogs," it is better to have

a shaggy coat than a sleek one with a chain-mark on it. Moreover, Collectivist municipalities have not proved a success.

Nor will Communism in any form be possible. Religious men may unite in small bodies and give up their will and possessions, but not anti-religious mobs or multitudes. Nor will they agree with each other, whether they are subjected to a central authority or ruled by Labor Unions, or are independent republics or without rule at all. The greater States have not done so; neither will they. Nor will arbitration avail. It has not succeeded now, while some vestiges of Christian ethics linger in International Law. Will it, when International Law is based on the power to seize what is wanted?

But apart from the futility or fallaciousness of all these theories, the fact that they propose to destroy all civil and domestic institutions must necessarily array against them every man who loves his home, his family, and his country, or in whom there remains any sense of duty to God. The ruin that is meditated and avowed dispenses with reasoning on the truth or falsehood of the doctrine.

Nor out of the resulting chaos can it be hoped that those who have shown ability only to destroy will be able to construct any of their ideal states of the future. Unless the history of mankind is going suddenly to reverse itself, the issue, in the event not merely of universal anarchy—people will not wait for that—but even of widespread disorder, must inevitably be that the remorseless tyranny of some military ruler will restore tranquillity, if not peace, through oppression and bloodshed.

How can we avert such a calamity? The answer is that there must be a prudent, sincere, unbiassed, upright

and courageous intervention on the part of the State. For its own preservation it must repress all riot and disorder, and for the same reason compel the dissolution of those associations which are plotting anarchy, just as it must encourage those which make for the spiritual and temporal betterment of the working classes. It must legislate especially for the protection of the poor, who are more helpless than the rich; it must prohibit anything like starvation wages and protracted hours of labor; it must insist on compensation not merely for what is perhaps compulsorily and usuriously agreed to, but for what is necessary for proper support; it must compel the erection and maintenance of decent habitations; it must guard helpless women and children from labor that is excessive, or dangerous to health and morals; it must exact an equal distribution of taxes and not permit and, above all, not be in collusion with certain individuals or classes or combinations which reap enormous and ever-growing profits without bearing a proportionate share in the public burdens.

These and other regulations for the guidance of governments are laid down at length in that most memorable and valuable document which the United States Commissioner of Statistics, Carroll D. Wright, proudly boasts of carrying about with him as a *vade mecum,* viz., the Encyclical on the Condition of Labor, by the illustrious Pontiff, Leo XIII. It has already attracted the attention of the entire world.

But how are you going to influence the great money powers, which at the present time often control the machinery of governments, using it most selfishly and most cruelly for their own advantage? And how are you going to put a check on the angry multitudes who are,

or think they are, the victims of those powers? There is only one influence that is left, and that is religion, which, no matter how bad a man is, still lingers in his heart and exerts its power. But what kind of a religion? one naturally asks, as he looks around at the chaos that meets his gaze.

The only opponent of Socialism, according to the English anarchist, Hyndman, is the Catholic Church, and Vandevelde, the spokesman of Belgian Socialism, writes in the *Independent,* February 25, 1904, as follows:

"On the one hand are all those who hold that authority should descend from above, and who find in the Roman Catholic Church the most perfect expression of their ideal. On the other, those who insist that authority shall come from the people, and who by the logic of circumstances can find their hopes in nothing but Social Democracy. One may welcome or deplore the fact of this coming concentration about the Roman Catholic Church on the one side and the Social Democracy on the other, but no one can deny that this concentration is inevitable; and the future struggle will have to be fought out between these two armies. To those, therefore, who are interested in the social movement of Europe we say: 'Observe, above all else, if you wish to consider only the essential factors, the political activities of the Roman Catholic Church and those of International Socialism.'"

The mistake in these two declarations is that the Catholic Church is held to be an enemy. She is not. She will conquer, but conquer as a friend. Under these wild demands she detects many a glimmer of truth and many a just cause for complaint, while she also sees, unfortunately bound up and mingled with them, many outrageous and destructive errors which can bring only

disaster on their adherents. To eliminate the evil and secure the good is her only purpose. She is not unprepared for the fight; she expects it. She may be beaten at first, but she will ultimately triumph. She has had the experience before.

To the doctrine of the divinity of human nature she replies: Human nature is divine; not, however, in being part of the God-head, but in the resemblance with God by the fulfilment of the moral law, which is a reflex on man's mind of the eternal laws of justice that are written in the mind of God. The higher assimilations to the Divinity by adoption and filiation only a Catholic can understand, but they are nobler and more sublime than any pantheistic Socialist ever dreamed of.

To the clamor for International Brotherhood she makes answer: "I alone can give it to you. My very name Catholic implies that, but it will be an Internationalism which will not destroy the nations, but fortify them; not obliterate patriotism, but make it more acute and self-sacrificing; not degrade human nature, but lift it up and glorify it. The Black International, as you call me, will not do as the Red International, which typifies and preaches blood and carnage. The Black International is appareled indeed in the garments of sorrow, but it is sorrow for the sins of mankind; it is symbolical of its own sufferings and afflictions, which must be undergone, but through which alone happiness and peace are to be won for mankind.

The destruction of the marriage tie she will never permit. She will fight for its indissolubility though the world should seem to go to pieces about her, knowing by the divine light that is in her as well as by her nineteen hundred years of worldly trial that upon the stability of

the family and the dignity of woman depends the safety of the nations.

She will not countenance the right of revolution, if only for the reason that she has too often seen that these popular upheavals are planned mostly for the political ambition of individuals, and that the people are invariably the sufferers.

She makes light of the accusation that she has been always the ally of kings and princes. She has been when they reigned with justice; but most of her sorrows have come to her for withstanding them when they wrought iniquity. She alone dares to reprove, and threaten and condemn the rich and powerful.

She pays no heed to the calumny that she favors the rich. Her distinctive trait, as well as her glory, is that she is the Church of the poor. She has covered the world with her institutions of benevolence, and she has never ceased her care for the orphan, the sick, the abandoned, the fallen, the ignorant, the outcast and the criminal wherever they could be found, in the hospitals, in the orphanages, in the slums, in the prisons, and even on the scaffold, and her claim was never so much in evidence as to-day, when the Socialist government of France drives out from their country 160,000 admittedly blameless men and women whose only purpose in life was to devote themselves to the suffering members of humanity. The Church would have won too much esteem and power had such love been allowed to be lavished on the people. That the poor were to suffer in consequence was not considered for an instant. With her, poverty is no disgrace; it is an honor, and the rich and the poor meet on the same level at her altars.

Finally, she alone is the apostle of liberty. From the

time that Paul pleaded for the fugitive slave she has been striking off the shackles of the serf, and she alone to-day can save the workingman from a worse servitude than the one from which he is striving to emancipate himself. She alone preaches a true equality for all men, and the humblest can occupy and have occupied the most splendid posts in her hierarchy. Nor could it be otherwise, for she was established by the Son of God, who sounded the depths of human suffering and poverty, who was born in a stable and had not a grave of His own to be buried in.

On what lines does the Church propose to proceed? On the old lines:

1. By teaching, by inculcating, and almost by compelling, through the instrumentality of her pulpits, her schools and her confessionals, reverence for God, obedience to divine and human law, and love for humanity. The world around us is just now beginning to understand the power of these three bulwarks against destructive and revolutionary Socialism.

2. By consecrating, in all the glow and ardor of their youth, her countless armies of heroic sons and daughters who go down gladly into the depths of human misery, where they touch with their hand and feel with their heart all the physical and moral woes from which mankind is suffering, and by their voluntary poverty, their self-immolating benevolence, and also by the dazzling beauty of their lives, hold in check the angry and rebellious multitudes that are in danger of being led away.

3. By inspiring Catholic governments to initiate, not under pressure, but of their own volition, economic reforms which recognize and forestall the reasonable demands of the people, and to do so not for motives of

expediency or fear, but for reasons of right and justice. Such was the case when Europe was Catholic, when there were but few labor troubles, although the gigantic Workingmen's Guilds, better organized than are the Labor Unions of to-day, extended their influence everywhere in protecting and uplifting the workman, but at the same time rendering anarchy impossible because of the religious idea in which those organizations were conceived and by which they were strengthened and perpetuated. The attempt to resuscitate them by the present Protestant Emperor of Germany is a tribute to the wisdom of the Past; the failure to do so is an admission of the weakness of the religious spirit in the workingman of to-day.

Unfortunately, we have but one example at the present time of a government acting under such inspiration, but it is sufficient as an illustration, viz., Catholic Belgium, whose great manufacturing interests and condensed population seemed to afford a most promising field for a Socialist propaganda, but in which Socialism has not been able to secure a foothold because of the Christian solicitude of the government in providing for the needs of the people and in supporting the undertakings of private philanthropy. Socialism, in spite of its gigantic efforts, has found itself anticipated there, while the safeguard of religion among the people prevents the excesses into which great economic changes without such a restraint inevitably fall, and the country has been for over twenty years in the enjoyment of a prosperity unparalleled in its history.

A better example of this influence is found in the effect which Catholicism has had not merely on a country but on an entire race. Centuries of misrule would

naturally have hurled the entire Irish people into the hands of the Socialists, but the Irish reverence for parental, civil, and ecclesiastical authority ingrained in them by the Catholic training and tradition of long centuries has, to the amazement of the revolutionists, kept them as a body solid as a wall of brass on the side of order. There is no more faithful father of a family and no more self-sacrificing patriot in his native or his adopted country than an Irishman. There are some, unfortunately, on the wrong side, but an Irish anarchist or out-and-out Socialist is a recreant to his race and religion.

When it cannot mould an entire nation or race it avails itself of the popular elements at its disposal and fashions them into solid and enduring defences of their country. Thus, because and only because of this influence, have we the splendid spectacle of the German Catholics of to-day, whom Bismarck thirty years ago tried his best to exterminate, forgetting all that now and standing as the admitted defenders of that Protestant Empire against the inroads of Socialism. Take away the conservative force of Catholicism from the body of the people at large, and from their representatives in the Reichstag, and build up the 3,000,000 Socialist vote by the other millions that would be added were not Catholicism there to prevent it, and the great Empire would probably totter to its foundations. This condition of things in a country where Socialism had so much to hope for is sufficient to explain the bitter hatred entertained for Catholicism.

This bitterness is not reciprocated, though opposition to the economic and religious delusions of their opponents is none the less profound and unyielding. Catholics have been content to build up their strength quietly, and year after year for half a century, even in the midst of

galling persecution, they have come before the world to reiterate in assemblies ever increasing in number and importance their adherence to the principles of right and justice, until in our own day, within the walls of the Cathedral of Cologne, one of the most splendid monuments that the workingmen of the world have ever constructed, the Catholic Congress, grown now to 12,000 delegates, representing every social element from the parliamentarian and the professor to the peasant and the mechanic, some of whom voiced the will of organizations like the Volksverein of 300,000 or 400,000 members, came to report the vast work that had been accomplished in establishing workingmen and women's clubs, industrial schools, rural banks, industrial and agricultural federations, courses in sociology and political economy, and countless other beneficent organizations besides. It was the utterance of an overwhelming spirit of religion and patriotism making that magnificent and solemn declaration of fealty to God, religion and country, which gave the assurance not only to the rulers of Germany but to the world at large that where a people is influenced by genuine Christianity the country is safe from the enemies without and the still more dangerous foes who lurk within. Catholics of other countries would do well to follow their example.

On the same lines are the Catholics of France and Italy making their uphill fight. To those who have been able to study them closely the number of enterprises which they have inaugurated and carried to a successful issue for the betterment of the working classes is simply amazing, especially as it is done in spite of governments which do everything possible to thwart these efforts.

What are we to do? The same thing. Socialism with

us is not yet a formidable political power, but there is all the more reason, before it becomes an aggressive and organized force, to build up an army of federated associations actuated by principles which are antagonistic to or corrective of those dangerous doctrines we have been considering; a great conservative body of men, who can always be relied on as the champions of law and order, who, far from being a source of apprehension for their fellow countrymen, will be recognized as staunch defenders of justice and right; men who believe in the rights of property, the sanctity of marriage, the love of country, the right of liberty and the rational pursuit of happiness, and who base all these claims not on convenience or expediency, but because the light of reason and the light of religion reveal them as springing from the eternal laws which reason and revelation keep constantly before our eyes. Men who are penetrated with such principles will be the pillars of their country in time of peace and its staunchest defenders in time of war. The solution of the problem rests largely, if not exclusively with us.

T. J. Campbell, S.J.

Christian Labor Unions in Germany

Mr. A. Pelzer, in the *Catholic Social Review* of Louvain (July and September, 1905), and M. Max Turmann, in *German Workingmen's Unions* (tract from the quarterly publication, *L'Action Populaire*), have been studying the Christian Club movement in Germany. This movement interests all those concerned with social questions, and the press has lately taken it up in connection with the important strikes on the Ruhr. We shall, with Messrs. Pelzer and Turmann, examine their origins, their directing ideas and their organization.

To quote M. Pelzer, the union movement was prepared by the associations of Dr. Max Hirsch,(1) who, in 1868, endeavored to analyze the workings of the English or-

(1) M. Max Turmann goes even further back:

"The oldest professional association of which we have knowledge across the Rhine would seem to be the National Association of German Printers. It was established in Mayence in 1848. In the intention of its promoters it was to bring together employers and workingmen. But the former refused their adherence, though the majority had seemed to be won over to the idea of their employees. It required long preliminaries before, in 1867, the association was able to unite the two elements in the world of labor. Masters and men were at once to give the association the following bases: reduction of the day's work to nine hours and a slight increase of salary, the latter established for a term of five years; however, after three full years this tariff, freely consented to by patrons and workingmen, might be decreased where the number of contracting parties had not increased; in any case, at the expiration of the five years the same tariff might hold good for another year, by mutual consent, and its annulment must be demanded three months in advance.

"From these few details it is evident that the *National Association of German Printers* was, from the professional standpoint, very well organized. It was also to prosper; from 5,000 members in 1868 it had increased in 1900 to 27,187 adherents."

ganizations of labor, and afterwards set forth in several newspaper articles the result of his researches.

The *Kirsch-Dunkersche Gewerkverein* was founded. By the end of 1869 this organization was established in over 250 localities and numbered about 30,000 members.

The basis of this organization, writes M. Max Turmann, consists of a national association comprising one single profession, an asociation which finds support itself in the local organizations. In 1900, the number of local unions was 190, grouping 86,777 members. At the head of each trade association, or *Gewerkverein,* is a general council, named by election. Since 1869 a general representation of all these associations exists: it is the *Verband der Deutschen Gewerkvereine.* The direction of the Verband is entrusted to a "central counselor," assisted by a "legal adviser of the Union." The post of central counselor has been filled since the foundation by M. Max Hirsch, who also directs the organ of the Union, the *Gewerkverein.* Finally, the Diet of the *Verband* assembles every three years.

This, however, was not the Christian Union as it exists to-day. The latter movement is due to the personal initiative influence of Mgr. Ketteler. It assumed its definite form with Mgr. Hitze in 1894, as explained by the *Catholic Social Review* of Louvain, which will be our principal guide.

After having brought to mind Catholic teachings concerning property in the striking sermons preached at Mayence in 1848, Mgr. Ketteler, in his pamphlet "The Labor Question and Catholicism" (1864), examined the situation of the working class and the remedies proposed by liberals such as Schultze, and radicals of the kind of Lassalle. He demonstrated chiefly that social reform

will not take place without the concurrence of Christianity. "The Church does not act upon the social state in an immediate fashion, by outward means and more or less mechanical institutions, but firstly, and above all, by the spirit it breathes into men," a spirit of charity and of self-denial, which will bring the rich and the laboring classes to moderation, and which will turn thus not only to their mental advantage, but also to the welfare of society.

During four years, from 1864 to 1869, the Bishop of Mayence devoted himself to explaining what he meant, in the Christian and legitimate sense of the word, by the "claim of the working class." At Notre-Dame-du-Bois-lez-Mayence, in 1869, he again took up his plan of reform before an audience of workingmen.

He demanded, in particular, an increase of salary relative to the true value of the work, decrease of working hours, the obtaining days of rest, interdiction of the toil of women and children in factories.

He inscribed these points (except the first) in the sketch of a political programme which he had composed towards the close of the Franco-Prussian war and which appeared in 1873 under the title, "Catholics in the German Empire." It is known that the Centre Party, held back at first by the *Kulturkampf,* strove, even in 1877, by the bill "Galen and associates," to have this social programme triumph in the German Reichstag.

The bishop endeavors in this programme to make the idea of Cooperation of Production prevail over that of Cooperation of Consumption. He does not underrate the difficulties of the undertaking, but he does not turn, as the Socialist unions do, to the State treasury. He sees in this process "an attempt on the rights of prop-

erty," which, nevertheless, would "prove ineffectual." He hopes "Christian souls will be found to aid in the realization of his idea."

That idea will advance slowly, but surely. In 1872 the first essays are made. The Catholic miners on the Ruhr are the inaugurators of the organizations.

That year (1872), on the occurrence of a partial strike, a professional union of miners was formed, the direction of which was composed of Catholics and Protestants. This lasted only a short time. But the idea which had inspired it remained active with a large number of workmen, both Catholics and Protestants: it was proposed to enroll in one body all the miners, without distinction of party or religion, and to oppose this organized mass to the master coal dealers of the country.

In 1877 the miner Rosenkranz, though he was personally an earnest Catholic and attached to the Centre Party, succeeded in founding a "Union of Rhenish and Westphalian miners," which excluded from its sphere of action, after the first paragraph of its statutes, "all affairs of a political, religious and public order." In all sincerity its author wished it to be purely professional, admitting all miners, even the Socialists, that it might become "great and powerful."

Though actively fought by the heads of the social movement, on account of the dangers of its neutrality, the union of miners was in part compromised by its Socialist members. Forbidden by employers, it was disbanded finally, in 1878, by the application of the anti-Socialist law.

Since then attempts at syndical organization were renewed, notably in 1884 and in 1889. In the latter year, following upon a gigantic miners' strike, which spread

over all Germany, the old union founded by Rosenkranz was called into being again (*Alter Verband*). Unfortunately, the Socialist directors did not observe the neutrality inscribed in the statutes. Their delegates were not able to put aside these chiefs in the change of administration, and in 1890 the Christian workmen withdrew from the association. A new union, founded by a Christian miner of the name of Fischer, was not successful, and disappeared in 1892.

It had been proved by facts that the idea of neutrality, prematurely defended by Rosenkranz, had no chance of realization in actual conditions. If they did not wish to enter, or to see themselves some day forced to enter, a union which was virtually Socialistic and anti-religious, it only remained for the Christian miners to form an organization apart. This is what they did at Essen, August 26, 1894, by the establishment of the "Union of Christian miners of the mining district of Dortmund," which owes its existence to Augustus Brust, a simple miner.

But for twenty years (1868-1890) Catholic workingmen sought for their exact bearings. They adopted, with regard to existing unions, an attitude of reserve and mistrust which the action of the same, especially of the Socialists, sufficiently justified. They did not seek to clearly concentrate the truth which the new movement contained, to clear the union idea of the political and anti-religious alloy which falsified it in existing organizations. . . . After 1890 another attitude succeeds that of reserve. The union problem is squarely faced by German Catholics.

Up to that time certain foundations, such as the Relief Fund, had been created, especially since 1884, the ma-

terial advantages of which aimed too exclusively at the welfare of the individual. Now workingmen realize the community of their interests, look upon themselves as conjointly liable, and do not hesitate to make considerable sacrifices which, perhaps not until long after, will reach and benefit other companions in labor.

Up to that time the members of Catholic Workingmen's Societies were preserved mainly from anti-religious and Socialistic influence. Now to the culture of the Catholic spirit is joined a marked care for the economic and social education of members to prepare them for united action. A clear proof of this is found in the conferences and social courses organized, since 1890, by the Catholic Workingmen's Societies, the libraries founded by them for their members, and the investigations they undertake.

Let us add that each Federation has its weekly journal: *Der Arbeiter* at Berlin, *Der Arbeiter* at Munich, and M.-Gladbach's *Die Westdeutsche Arbeiterzeitung*. . . . It will be enough to glance through the latter organ, which prints as many as 41,500 copies and which the next Congress of Federation will perhaps oblige all members to take, to see with what energy and with what practical sense the interests of labor are defended in it, and how much the solid and substantial articles in the paper contribute to the social formation of its readers.

As for the causes which created the new organization of Catholic Societies of Labor, we must seek for them not alone in the personal experience of the workingmen and the priests engaged with these societies, but also in a combination of untoward circumstances, notably in the recent economic, associative, social and political evolution of the German Empire.

A new and more definite evolution was preparing. Already in January, 1891, the *Kölner Korrespondenzblatt,* organ of the presidents of the Catholic Societies of Labor, had published a project of organization wherein it was recommended to establish within the Societies of Labor special sections of a syndical nature. On September 26, 1894, the same subject was taken up again and thoroughly discussed in a meeting of the directors of the Societies of Labor for the archdiocese of Cologne. The programme traced by Mgr. Hitze was approved; it contained the following points: 1st, Workingmen, as well as other professional groups, have the right and the duty to associate for the protection and safeguarding of their professional interests; 2d, with very few exceptions, all existing trade asociations (unions) are under Liberal and Socialistic influences, and consequently constitute a considerable danger for Christian workingmen; 3d, the danger can be averted only by one of two means: either by the creation of Christian unions, or else by grouping the Christian workingmen so that they may be able to paralyze the influence of Socialism and Liberalism; 4th, the formation of trade sections in Catholic workingmen's clubs is the best and surest way to arrive at a wholesome and efficacious organization of our workingmen, whether the said organization become autonomous or whether it be made within the limits of existing organizations; 5th, the action of the trade section is confined to the pursuit of professional material interests. Festivities and amusements are excluded. Save where the president of the society expressly gives permission, it is necessary to be a member of the society in order to be admitted to the professional section.

With this program, the Catholic union movement

took on remarkable proportions. We soon beheld the formation of the Syndicate of Christian Miners of the mining district of Dortmund.

After the organization of the miners in 1894, we also see formed, among others: in December, 1895, in the principality of Lippe, a syndicate of brick-makers; in 1897, textile unions at Aix-la-Chapelle, Bossette, Eupen, and Düren, as also the union of miners and metal workers of the district of Bonn, established with the help of Pastor Stocker and the Abbé Brauns; in 1898 and 1899, the textile unions of Krefeld and M. Gladbach.(1)

It remained to effect the federation of local unions. The organized working bodies soon understood the necessity of this step. Firstly, they saw that divergences in the conception of united action which existed between unions of the same profession, but of different localities, created a great obstacle to the ultimate development of

(1) Still they were far from the powerful organization of the Socialistic unions. M. Max Turmann explains to us the enormous progress these had made since the abolition of the law of exception (1st October, 1890). "The *Gewerkschaften,* although *in fact* Socialistic unions, *in appearance* are independent unions: they even frequently so name themselves. They are open to all workers of the profession, of whatsoever age or sex, without obligation to accept the principles of the *"Sozial Democratie"* (Socialism). This point was settled by Legien at the Frankfort Congress. The *Gewerkschaften,* he declared, are not Socialistic, because they do not make the admission of a workingman dependent upon his adhesion to the doctrines of Socialism. They are not affiliated to the party of labor, and in this they differ profoundly from certain French unions."

This distinction has been well elucidated by M. Karl Kautsky, a German theorist of federation. "The essential difference," he writes, "between France and Germany seems to me to lie in the fact that in France neutrality is a question of organization, while in Germany it is a question of propaganda. In Germany, with the exception of an insignificant minority, Socialists and Unionists alike admit that unions, considered as organizations, should be absolutely independent of the political groupings of Socialistic democracy." (Note of *Questions Actuelles.*)

the movement, an obstacle only to be overcome by an understanding upon one identical programme. Further, the experience of economic struggles which they had had to undergo had taught them that they could not triumph without the support of unionist comrades not of their own locality.

The good movement demanded assistance, and required that a strong power should give it impulse. The Catholic Congresses of Mayence, Frankfort, Krefeld and Munich were an opening.

The first Congress was held at Mayence, at Pentecost, 1899. Thirty delegates from the North and 18 from the South of Germany represented 37 unions, mostly local, 19 of which numbered 55,661 members. The order of the day, carefully determined upon in two preceding meetings, bore upon the question of organization. After three days' discussion, the Congress unanimously agreed upon the constitutional charter.

Christian unions were to be interdenominational, that is, to unite the members belonging to the two denominations. They placed themselves upon the common ground of Christianity.(1) They adhered to no political party. If discussions bearing upon political party questions were

---

(1) It will not be without use to note here that in Germany certain Protestants have been for many long years united to the Catholics on the ground of elections, and the Review *Le Sillon,* which had reproved the Center for being exclusively a "Catholic party," has just published a letter of rectification (10th October, 1905), dated from Büchelberg (Bavarian Palatinate), in which we read: "The Center is nothing else than a political and social party, no doubt constituted for the larger part by Catholics, but also by Protestants (Bruel, de Gerlach, Schultz, etc.). The Bishop von Ketteler, for example, was succeeded in the Reichstag by the Protestant, Schultz, and half of the Deputies from the (Protestant) province of Hanover belong to the Centre." (Note of *Questions Actuelles.*)

forbidden, it was nevertheless necessary to discuss the introduction of legal reforms on the grounds of existing social order. The unions should federate by professions of the same nature and by closed industrial territories. The unions pursue, in general, the improvement of the material and intellectual condition of laborers of the profession. They are encouraged to take a position in conformity with the principles of Christianity and of political economy, with regard to the most important questions of the profession, such as salary(1) and the duration of labor; to organize, where legal assurance is insufficient, funds and associations against sickness, acci-

---

(1) The Abbé Cetty, in *Choses d'Allemagne*, a pamphlet of *l'Action Populaire*, writes concerning salary in Germany:

"The law of insurance against sickness (10th April, 1892) imposes upon the higher authorities the duty of making known to the government the average salaries of workingmen taking out insurance. This investigation, which appeared in 1900, showed that salaries had sensibly increased since 1892. The increase is apparent in the city and in the country, for agriculture as well as industry. No doubt the rapid growth of German industries during the latter years partly explains this consoling phenomenon, but it is not the only factor to be considered. There is here obedience to a law almost constant for more than half a century. This law holds good for the laborer in the fields and for the workman in the shop.

Still, notwithstanding the increase, salary leaves much to be desired. In many cases reform is imperative. In Germany salaried workingmen number above 12 millions. That is, with the members of the family added, almost a half of the whole population. Salary is, therefore, a question of life and death. We repeat that the condition of professional labor is much improved; abject poverty exists no longer, save in sporadic cases. In Prussia in 1892, 70 per cent. had a salary of less than 1,100 francs; in 1900 the rate is 62 per cent. In Saxony an income inferior to 600 francs was in the proportion of 51 per cent. in 1892; in 1894, at 36; in 1900, at 28. Improvement is therefore considerable, and Socialists can no longer defend the thesis that black misery is on the increase. It is no less true that with this salary it is well-nigh impossible to support a family." (Note of *Questions Actuelles.*)

dents, stoppage of work, and incapacity; to overlook the application of measures for the protection of labor.

As for the means proposed, the Congress foresees the creation of a professional organ. It engages to organize investigations, to gather materials and statistics which may be useful, for instance, in negotiating with employers. It desires the organization of conferences where social legislation mainly will be discussed, its desiderata, the condition of workingmen of the trade, the efforts made and results obtained by the comrades of other countries or other territories.

As regards the tactics of unions, the Congress asserts the commonalty of interests which binds the employer and the employee; both should, above all, represent the interests of the production of goods as against their consumption. Both seek, and rightfully, to get the highest possible interest out of the capital they have put into the production of goods: the employer, capital; the workingman, labor—strength. Therefore a spirit of conciliation should pervade all the activity of unions. Claims should be moderate, but sustained with energy. Strikes should be resorted to as a last measure, and only when there are chances of success.

The object was now clearly defined; to attain it, it was necessary to aim, above all, at making these organizations as strong as possible in number, in unity of views and in internal cohesion. This was the main care of the second Congress of Christian Unions, held at Frankfort during the Pentecost holidays of 1900.

In this Congress all the Christian unions were invited to join in one general, single federation (*Gesammtverband der christlichen Gewerkschaften*), presided over by a committee in which each union or federation should

be represented at least by one delegate. This committee chooses from its midst, and controls by its direction, an executive committee composed of five persons, forming a sort of permanent deputation for the dispatch of current affairs. It gives information, works at the establishment of new unions, and settles differences of opinion which might arise, and upon which in last appeal the next Congress of Christian Unions will pronounce.

To attach workingmen to the unions the Congress recommends the institution of funds of relief or insurance in such manner that members who withdraw from the unions should at once lose the dues paid in. It also takes strikes into consideration, declaring they should not be resorted to save in last extremities, after having endeavored to come to an amicable understanding.

But one question was long debated: that of the neutrality of the union movement. The delegates of Cologne asked the Congress whether the Christian unions might entertain the thought of some day fusing into one single body with the Socialistic unions; if it was necessary to recognize in the Christian unions a temporary, provisional, and relative necessity or an absolute and definite necessity. These debates were much commented upon by the Socialistic and Liberal press; the attitude of the Congress was sometimes misrepresented and falsified, and reports of very divergent nature were addressed to the episcopal authorities. Several bishops took alarm. Mgr. Nörber, Archbishop of Freiburg, formally reproved the Congress for sharing condemned tendencies, and for using the word Christian as a "sign"; the more important associations, those of the weavers and miners, declared that, although they hoped one day to see all workingmen associated for the safeguarding of their economic

interests, they would never wish to oppose Christian principles in their economic action.

The executive committee, in its turn, took note of the matter in its meeting, November 8, 1900. With the exception of Mr. Wicher, representing the Federation of Metal Workers of Duisburg, the members were unanimous in signing the following declaration: 1. Members of the Christian unions, who have created these at the price of considerable effort and sacrifice, should protest energetically against the words of the message of Mgr. the Archbishop of Freiburg, that the word "Christian" is for them but a vain word and a sign and that they are only "organizing for Socialism the centres still attached . . . to the actual social order." No fact justifies this supposition, expressed by the mandate in question, and by a small minority of the Catholic press, without authority, a supposition wounding undeservedly members and friends of the working class who have cooperated until now in the movement of Christian unions. 2. We wish to declare that we will in future, as in the past, be ruled by Christian principles in the pursuit of union ends. No doubt the union of all workingmen of the different trades into single organizations constitutes the ideal to be pursued; but it must be insisted upon that such federations shall not contradict Christian principles in their actions. Since, in actual junctures, such like federations do not seem realizable for many a day to come (*in absehbarer Zeit ausgeschlossen*), we adhere to the programme fixed at Mayence, in the first Congress of Christian Unions, according to which Christian interdenominational unions are organized on a Christian basis, without attaching themslves to any political party.

The question of neutrality was again broached at the

third Congress of Christian Unions, held at Krefeld from the 26th to the 29th of May, 1901.

Forty delegates, representing 99,460 members, against eleven delegates, representing 7,730 members, voted an order of the day which approved the attitude of the executive committee, without, however, obliging the unions to share its views upon a question "which at present has no practical issue." So that unions adhering to the contrary opinion on the future character of unions were not for this reason excluded either from the congresses or from general federation.

The Congress of Krefeld further definitely drew up the statutes for general federation, returned the subject of insurance funds, and took a stand on several questions of legislation.

Eager always to increase the power of economic action in unions, the Congress recommended the placing in one sole and same fund the dues paid in by members to serve strictly for union ends, and the others for relief in case of sickness or death. It held that "Special funds should not be created save where conditions make them imperative."

Within the same order of ideas, the Congress specially discussed the organization of assistance in case of travel or stoppage, so that unions might be able to adapt the offer of labor to the demand, and to regulate it to their advantage. (1)

---

(1) Abbé Cetty writes again (*Choses d'Allemagne*):

"Germany continues to extend the network of her insurances of labor. She perfects, amends existing insurances and prepares new ones. Day by day the administration of these laws grows more normal and more fruitful. Experience and observation unite in pointing out their happy social results.

"The insurance against sickness has been modified in some

The fourth Congress of Christian Unions was held in Munich from the 29th of June to the 2d of July, 1902.

Means were sought to win agricultural laborers and women workers to the idea of union. Cooperative societies were discussed, and the attempt of intellectual improvement among workingmen.

After having inquired into the causes which withheld women from the unions, the Congress took action upon a programme which remedied their situation and established a tangible, objective end, likely to attract them. It busied itself, furthermore, with what kind of union organization was best suited to them.

As for agricultural laborers, it is easy to understand the motives which induced the Congress to take an interest in their situation. It was more difficult to gather these into unions, the Prussian law of 1854 condemning them to imprisonment for as much as one year to prevent attempts at coalition among field laborers, whom it classed with servants. The Congress charged its execu-

---

essential points, and, notwithstanding the importance of these modifications, the government has made further promises regarding the almost entire revision of the whole organization. Meanwhile, workingmen benefit by the reforms adopted by the law.

"To begin with, insurance against sickness has been extended to apprentices of the trades and of business; it is a considerable extension, and fully justified. These young people, so interesting, so worthy of sympathy, have entered into the great laboring family to hold a place in it and to obtain help and protection.

"A long desired reform is at length accomplished. Relief, in case of sickness, covered 13 weeks; in future the term will be doubled—26 weeks, a half-year. It is a social benefaction which the laboring world has greeted with joy. The law concerning invalidity assures assistance only after 26 weeks of sickness. There lay, therefore, between the 13 weeks of insurance against sickness and the 26 weeks against invalidity a space of 13 weeks, during which the unfortunate laborer was abandoned to his distress. Henceforth the bridge is made, the abyss is covered. There is no interval between the two insurances." (Note of *Questions Actuelles.*)

tive committee to address to the government and to the German Reichstag a petition which demanded the right of coalition for agricultural laborers. While waiting for the removal of the legal difficulty, the Congress judged it necessary to group agricultural laborers into associations analogous with denominational labor societies, having for chief end to elevate their intellectual standing, to guarantee legal assistance, and to create relief funds.

More resolute as to what concerns cooperation of production, societies whereof it wishes founded when this is possible, the Congress lengthily discussed what attitude the unions should preserve towards the consumers' companies. Different opinions were aired as to the connections to be established between these and the Christian unions. Several delegates would have liked to see the cooperative movement develop in an absolutely autonomous manner and form the third branch of the Christian labor movement, alongside the unions and the denominational labor societies.

The preceding paragraphs clearly show the important part played by Christian unions. After having prepared a general consent by determining the fundamental charter of the Christian unions movement, the workingmen directors have been brought, inside of a very few years, thanks to the Congresses, to know clearly their ideas and obligations, to study more closely the proper ends of union, to develop internal cohesion and the numerical strength of their associations, and to take a stand upon the subject of labor reforms to the order of the day.(1)

(1) These efforts have met with the success they deserved, as the following figures will witness. (See the very detailed report of the Secretary-General: *Zentralblatt*, 15th May, 1905).

The number of German Christian union workers has changed from 192,607 members, average for 1903, to 207,848, average for

It remains for us to study the distinctive characteristics of the Christian unions, or *Christliche Gewerkvereine*. We will follow in this matter the very accurate work of M. Max Turmann.

The foundation of these unions has been made necessary by the anti-religious attitude of the Socialistic *Gewerkschaften*. Therefore are the *Christliche Gewerkvereine* of opinion that "so long as the Social-Democratic groups shall make it their business to put Christian principles out of economic life, so long as they are a means

---

1904; on the first of April, 1905, the number is 274,860, which constitutes an increase, in the space of two years, of 14,877, and of 71,699 members. To the number of members, 192,607 (207,484), we oppose at the same dates (1903-1904), the following numbers of other union organizations: 887,698 (1,052,108) members in the "free" federations, in reality Socialistic; 17,577 (20,686) members in the purely Socialistic local unions; 110,215 (111,889) members in the Hirsch-Duncker unions, 111,709 (130,514) members in the independent associations.

If the Christian unions to which these contingents belong are not all enrolled in the general federation, the latter nevertheless makes great progress. Instead of the 100,053 members it numbered in 1904, it counts this year (1st April) 17 central federations with a membership of 195,401, the great majority, 145,000 members exactly, being recruited in the provinces of Rhineland and Westphalia.

Up to April 1, 1904, 24 organs of the Christian unions were in existence, half of them appearing weekly. Their total circulation rises to 312,000 copies.

The union federations, accounted for in statistics, have seen their statements rise from one year to another, receipts from 1,131,605 marks to 1,337,341 marks; expenditures from 938,363 marks to 1,094,643 marks, and their balance from 754,107 marks to 948,196 marks (on December 1, 1904).

On a total expenditure of 711,699 marks for the year 1904, the unions grouped in the general federation employed, amongst other sums: 133,362 marks to support strikers and the victims of drastic measures, 111,995 marks to pay the organs of the federations, 61,547 marks for propaganda, 55,036 marks for administration, 58,879 marks for various assistance, notably cases of decease; 8,727 marks for libraries and social and unionistic education, etc.

During the year 1904 Christian unions took part, with 14,818 members, in 291 contests, 143 of which ended in strikes and lock-

of agitation for their party, Catholic workingmen will have to remain firmly united in an autonomous association."

But they do not wish to give an exclusively denominational character to their *Gewerkvereine*. Many of these are, as they are styled there, "interdenominational," receiving Protestants as well as Catholics, and not worrying to convert the adherents to either of these two creeds. One thing alone is required of members of these associations: "that they should profess a religion in conformity with the order of the societies, that is, belief in God, and the recognition of a natural, spiritual, and temporal order."

However, in the greater number of these bodies the large majority of members are Catholics. Still, it may happen that the Protestants predominate. Such is the case in the union of brick-makers of Lippe, who present another curious feature: masters and workmen unite to defend their common interests against contractors of brick work. Being compelled, during the season, to work

---

outs, involving 8,019 members. Ninety-two aggressive strikes are counted, involving 2,770 members; 25 defensive strikes, with 280 members involved; 26 lock-outs, affecting 1,439 members. As to contests and strikes, the Christian unions have conducted 74 themselves alone, and 152 with other organizations; while figures are wanting for the other cases. It is to be observed that in 96 cases the majority of those involved belonged to the Christian unions.

The textile workers have taken part in 53 contests, builders in 62, metal workers in 65, wood workers in 57, tobacco workers in 18, shoemakers in 7, tailors in 4.

As for the results of strikes, 62 aggressive strikes were crowned with success, 19 were successful in part, 11 failed. Eight defensive strikes succeeded; 10 brought partial success; 7 were unsuccessful.

Lastly, on 26 lock-outs, 6 only ended unfavorably for the workers. In the building industry 14 lock-outs out of 15 ended in a collective contract favorable to the workmen.

far from their homes, masters and men take their meals together and associate with great cordiality. An arrangement is in force by which profits are divided proportionally between masters and workingmen. Contractors naturally fight these associations, but the government, on the other hand, supports them.

From the political standpoint, the *Christliche Gewerkvereine* are affiliated to no party and do not proclaim themselves as belonging to the Centre; they purpose preserving a purely economic character and wish to stand solely on professional grounds. This was particularly insisted upon in the convention which the Union of Christian Miners held last June at Oberhausen, and in which the delegates represented 80,000 members.

In the course of his recent researches M. Tondeur-Scheffler has ascertained that "in the case of co-existence in the same place of Christian *Gewerkvereine* and Socialistic *Gewerkschaften,* the latter seem to exclude carefully political anti-religious tendencies. Here is a symptom, adds the delegate of the Social Museum, which is certainly not without interest, for it seems to attest the strength already acquired by the Christian unions, although they are still of quite recent creation."

But M. Tondeur-Scheffler likewise remarks, "that it happens already that, in practice, these two associations, albeit of a different order, unite to advance in temporary accord towards a given end where the question is purely a professional one, as, for instance, the modification of salary. For this reason it is not strange to see the *Christliche Gewerkvereine* unite with the Socialistic *Gewerkschaften* in case of a strike breaking out over a question of this kind."

The behavior of Christian unions in strikes is very

explicitly treated by the Abbé D. Pieper, secretary-general of the *Volksverein,* in the volume which he has consecrated to the *Christliche Gewerkvereine.*(1) Here, however, are the terms in which M. Andrew Dupin sums up the directive principles which inspire these bodies.(2)

The spirit which animates them is a peaceful and conservative spirit; for they wish, above all, to insure the respect for those natural and Christian laws upon which the social order rests. They see between workmen and masters a multitude of points in common. All industrial improvements, all questions of market, of colonial and customs policy, touch the former in the same manner as the latter. But, together with this harmony, opposite interests also exist. They proceed from the fact that the workingman finds himself better or worse paid, according to the greater or lesser share of profits which the employer makes over to him.

The mission of Christian unions is to regulate this strife according to the law of equity by taking an attitude at once moderate and energetic. If masters are to treat the workingman "as a human person whose rights are not to be lessened," the workmen, on the other hand, should speak to employers respectfully, but on the footing of complete equality, "as a neighbor to a neighbor." When they name a committee to present their grievances, the same shall not assume a trenchant tone nor resemble "a delegation of war taking an ultimatum to an adversary."

These principles established, let us see what means Christian unions employ to carry them out.

---

(1) Published at München-Gladbach, Cf. p. 21 and following.
(2) André Dupin. *Du mouvement syndical ouvrier dans l'industrie allemande,* p. 307 and following.

It is necessary first, continues M. André Dupin, to try and satisfy the desires of the workingmen by negotiations with the employers. It is the first means which should appeal to a Christian organization. Therefore it is well to create, in each foundation, a workingmen's committee which shall be anxious to concur as well as the employers in the maintenance of peace. As soon as a grievance comes to light, the committee examines into it and decides whether it is founded or not. In the first case only it carries it to the employers and discusses with them the means of coming to an agreement. If the employers refuse to discuss the preliminaries with the committee, the latter appeals to the union, which itself engages in fresh negotiations.

When all peaceful tentatives have failed, one means only is left, which is a strike. It must, says Dr. Pieper, be resorted to without fear, but must always be used loyally.

"When a decision of such gravity is to be taken, two questions are to be considered: 1st, Is the strike just? 2d, Is it likely to be successful?

"Is it just?—for nothing authorizes union workmen to suspend work without a sufficient cause. The union must be able to give the reasons which prompt its decision and make public opinion the judge of them.

"It should also be examined whether there are chances of success. On the eve of battle the union must, like a prudent chief, pass its forces in review and reconnoitre the ground. It must ask itself whether it can make the necessary sacrifices, and if it will adopt sufficient means to assure the success of the strike; it must also consider the general state of affairs. This is an important point, for at a time of crisis the employer often welcomes a suspen-

sion of labor, which gives him a chance to get rid of the product with which he is encumbered."

Such is, from the standpoint of labor conflicts, the program of the Christian unions.

This program has not remained in the domain of theory; it has been put in practice. It would be easy to mention several important strikes supported by the *Christliche Gewerkvereine;* we will only name that of the miners of Pietsberg, of the velvet weavers of Krefeld in 1899, and, nearer to us, this very year, the strike of the miners of the Ruhr district.

It will be remembered that in the subscription opened for the latter strike, Cardinals Fischer and Kopp attracted much attention by their generous donations.

* * *

Workingmen can therefore recognize that these unions are organized to render them all manner of services.

One of the characteristics of the *Christliche Gewerkvereine* organization is the centralizing of authority in the hands of a few, and also the respect of all the unionists for this authority. The authority, which is very firm, says M. G. Blondel, is divided between the president, the secretary-general, and a sort of directive council, composed of men called *Obmänner* (arbiters). The secretary-general should be by preference a man familiar with matters of bookkeeping and administration, having intellectual culture, and should be assured of a suitable salary; he need not necessarily be a workingman. On the other hand, the presidency, which confers extended disciplinary powers, is bestowed upon a workingman. Questions of special importance are transmitted by the *Obmänner,* who are the envoys of the workingmen. To better the condition of their members, the Christian unions try to

intervene in the labor contract; substituting themselves for the isolated laborer, they wish that the liberty of the contract of labor, an economic conquest which they fully intend to enjoy, should become a reality for the laborers without means. . . . The union will enable these to draw higher salaries and to obtain more humane treatment.

The *Christliche Gewerkvereine* do not busy themselves only with salary, but also with all other questions relative to the moral and material welfare of workingmen. Thus they create bureaus of employment by administering those instituted by the communes. They also establish relief funds, notably against sickness, for burial expenses, and travel funds to enable laborers without work to go to those localities pointed out to them by the bureaus of employment.

The *Christliche Gewerkvereine* are also concerned with the elevation of the moral and intellectual standing of the workingman. For this purpose they arrange lectures on subjects of actual interest; and, furthermore, their divers corporative organs give information as to the state of professional affairs and of the different points of importance to the trade. Finally, an effort is made to give workingmen a knowledge of the principal protective laws of which, only too often, they have not the least idea, and which in consequence they cannot invoke in time of need.

With such an organization, and such care to render constant service to the workmen, it is easily understood that the *Christliche Gewerkvereine* increase every year in number and in power: in 1900 they numbered 160,772 members; on January 1, 1905, this figure had changed to 274,800, marking, on the total of the preceding year,

an increase of over 70,000 members. Let us add that the receipts in 1904 attained 1,131,605 marks and the expenditures 1,094,643.

These are fine results for efforts that do not date back beyond ten years.

Up to the latter date the Socialistic unions were alone in the effort to establish an understanding with similar unions in other countries. This is no longer the case: an international union has been formed among the Christian unions of textile workers in Germany, Holland and Belgium.

Immediately following upon the Congress of the Belgian Democratic League held at Louvain in 1897, two members of the union of cotton workers of Ghent (joined by M. Arthur Verhaegen, president of the League) were instructed to go and study the cotton industry and the labor organization of the industrial centre of Enschedé, in Holland. In consequence of this visit, continued relations were established between the professional Christian Union, *Unitas,*(1) of Holland, and the National Federation of Workers of the textile trade of Belgium.

In the month of June, 1900, the secretary of the society *Unitas* consulted the Belgian federation as to the useful results which might be obtained by a meeting of Christian workmen belonging to the textile industries of Holland, Belgium and Germany. The direction of the Democratic League made haste to meet the wishes of the Dutch unionists. A meeting of delegates belonging to the three nationalities was held at Aix-la-Chapelle the 29th of July, 1900. Something was done in the direc-

(1) This union, like the *Christliche Gewerkvereine,* admits both Catholics and Protestants.

tion of an international understanding, but the decisive step was not taken until the meetings of the 9th and 10th of September of the following year, at Düsseldorf.

After a long examination, the definite statutes of the alliance were unanimously voted. The text follows:

1. Members of the German, Dutch and Belgian federations, passing from one federation to another, will be dispensed from paying their entrance fee anew and admitted by the very fact that they have previously conformed with the statutes of their union and do declare that they will observe those of the union to which they desire to be affiliated.

2. Members who shall have so passed from one federation to another will enjoy the same privileges as their colleagues affiliated at the same time to one of the unions of their federation. The passage from one federation to the other, however, must take place within the four weeks following arrival in the country.

3. Assistance and subsidies shall be organized according to the special statutes of each federation. Nevertheless, to be entitled to relief in case of strike or of stoppage of work, it will be necessary to have belonged for at least six months to a union affiliated to one of the three federations. To enjoy the aid given in case of sickness, for funeral expenses, etc., it is necessary to have been a unionist for at least one year.(1)

4. In case of a strike or lockout the three federations shall owe one another assistance reciprocally, as often as the extent or the probable duration of the closing-

(1) This measure does not apply to the Belgian unions; for aid of this kind is, in Belgium, supplied exclusively by mutual companies, distinct from the unions.

down will not allow the federation directly affected to support itself.

5. The federation desiring help from the two others is held, as far as possible, to notify them four weeks in advance and to point out the causes and the eventual consequences of the strike.

In case of a sudden strike or of an unforeseen lockout it will be necessary to prove that the resistance is just and inevitable. In all conflicts members of unions must, furthermore, conform to the statutes of the federation and to the decisions of the directive committee, under penalty of losing all claim to assistance and to subsidies. In every serious case an international commission, composed of two Germans, one Dutchman and one Belgian,(1), may be constituted, and will decide if the occasion demands that the strikers be supported. This commission will have the right to enlist men of the trade and other counselors, so as to be perfectly informed upon the situation.

6. The three federations institute an international secretariate with residence established at Enschedé, in Holland. Half the costs and expenses of the international secretariate shall be defrayed by the German federations. and the other half by the Belgian and Dutch federations.

7. The three federations engage to give one another mutually, through the organ of the international secretariat, all useful information as to their organization and their activity, that they may succeed in drawing ever closer the bonds which unite them.

We are witnessing here the beginning of a movement

---

(1) The number of adherent German unions is far superior to that of the Dutch or Belgian adherents; hence the *double* number of representatives at the international commission.

which promises to be important. As yet, no doubt, we have but some twenty thousand Christian unionists of different countries uniting, but it is likely that the workers of other trades—by degrees, as their unionistic and national enrollment grows stronger—will follow this example. Therein lies a social phenomenon, the gravity of which certainly does not need to be underlined.

—From *Questions Actuelles.*

Socialism *

Like all others who speak of Socialism and wish to be clear, I must say at once whom I mean by Socialists—not the Anarchists who oppose all government, not the Communists who would have all things held in common, not the Extremists or Dynamiters who would use violence to attain their ends, not any of these whom there is no necessity to confute, but the scientific or moderate Socialists, who would proceed by way of the ballot-box, with law and order; and would contrive that sooner or later all capital or means of production or sources of income should be transferred to the hand of the State, whether the central or the local government.

SOCIALISM AND THE CHURCH

Now, the first question that may occur to you is whether, after all, this moderate Socialism is an enemy, whether there is any need of fighting, whether, at any rate in Great Britain, we have any complaint against the Socialists. Are they less civil to us than is any other non-Catholic body? Why pick a quarrel?

But Great Britain is not the whole world, and, looking outside, wherever the Catholic Church is a strong force and simultaneously the Socialists are a strong force, we see the two in violent antagonism. You have only to cross to Belgium to see them forming two political parties in daily hostility. At least half the blame of the cruel persecution of the Church in France falls on the shoul-

*A paper read at the Catholic Conference at Blackburn, Sept. 27, 1905.

ders of the Socialists. In Germany a strong government left off persecuting the Church because in her they recognized the only force that could withstand Socialism successfully. In Italy a government once bitterly anti-clerical is becoming eager for an alliance with the Church as a shield against the Socialists. The same antagonism is seen across the Atlantic. The two rapidly growing and spreading bodies in the United States are the Socialists, who already make up nearly half the voters, and over against them the Catholic Church. Within the last fourteen months two books have been published in the United States on the Catholic side, showing the true facts of the momentous case; the earliest, by Father Gettelmann, S.J., being an enlarged and adapted translation of Father Cathrein's work on Socialism in its eighth edition; the later book is by the Right Rev. William Stang, Bishop of Fall River, entitled "Socialism and Christianity"; and in neither book is there any question of conciliation. "Little can be done," writes a Socialist American magazine, "until men and women face the two curses of our country and our time, the curses of capitalism and Christianity." "The real Socialists," writes Bishop Stang, "have done with God and His eternal laws. . . . Real Socialism means rebellion against God and Society." And the Bishop writes from the long personal experience of his pastoral work. "Is there nothing in your way?" he asked a Socialist leader not long ago. "Yes, sir," the man answered slowly, "there is one thing in our way, and that one obstacle is the Catholic Church."

THREE MAIN PILLARS OF SOCIALISM

And yet it seems a pity to be compelled to take up arms against a scheme and a school that gives us so fair a

promise. Indeed, what could appear on the surface more reasonable than orderly Collectivism? Three principal arguments strike me as the pillars and props of the Socialist position. The first is the argument that it is just and fair for all men to start alike; and that if a man is to be poor and fill a low station, it is to be his own fault and own doing, and not due to the mere accident that he was born of poor parents, while another is in high station from no personal merit, but from the mere accident that he was born of rich parents. This may be called *the argument from justice.*

The second argument is from the immense saving to be worked by Collectivism, with its joint and orderly system of production and the avoidance of the incalculable waste of the competitive system, such as the vast sums spent on advertising or on the work of commercial travelers, a large body of the most intelligent men in the country, using up their brains and their time chiefly to induce purchasers to buy from one commercial house rather than from another. Then there is the waste of things made that no one wants, the waste of the spoilt or unsold goods, the waste of a dozen men doing what a couple could do if they only acted, in delivering goods, for example, in combination instead of competition, as letter delivery compared with milk delivery. Now all this waste is ended by Collectivism, which forms the logical conclusion to the great process you see around of producers, production and sale, even retail shops on the largest possible scale. What a vast fund will be in hand from all labor being usefully employed instead of some 25 per cent. being simply thrown away! This may be called *the argument from economy.*

The third argument is drawn from the evils that in

most industrial countries are the lot of so many: ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-housed, overworked, underpaid, unemployed, exposed from youth upwards to evil surroundings, moral and physical. A way out of these evils must be found. "We have found the way, and the only way," is the glad tidings or gospel of Socialism. "Present conditions are intolerable: your deliverance a necessity: Collectivism the one answer to your most urgent need."

This argument may be called *the argument from necessity;* and, backed up by its comrades, the arguments from justice and from economy, the three appear to offer a formidable front to all opponents; for like ethical considerations, monetary considerations, and humane considerations appear to drive us to the Socialistic conclusion. But then appearance is not always the same as reality.

COLLECTIVISM AND EQUALITY

Take the first argument: why should men start all on an equality? Tell a Brahmin he should start equal with a Pariah and he will laugh in your face. Ah! but the Hindus are sadly behind the age. Perhaps; but then ask the modern Germans, who are certainly in the front, and many of their philosophers will tell you that the business or function of the great mass of the people—German, British, or any other—is to minister to the welfare, physical and intellectual, of an *élite,* of a small number of superior beings. Or ask our own men of science, and they will declare that mere nature knows nothing of this equality, that everywhere is inequality, struggle, survival of the individual best adapted for the cosmic process. And quite apart from any question of wealth, any one can see the utter inequality of individuals at the very start, in-

equalities of health and physical capacities, of moral and intellectual qualities, of their temper, their wits and their memory; so that merely to equalize money fortunes would be a very imperfect attempt at giving all an equal start. Every unearned advantage in the race of life would have to be neutralized, every undeserved defect compensated; and so great would be the complication that it would require more than human power and impartiality to adjust the points of this practically universal handicap.

But, after all, does not Christianity preach equality? Undoubtedly; but not the Collectivist equality. One God indeed for all, one redemption, the same law, the same sacraments, the same conditions of salvation, the same human nature, alike in the sad weakness from original sin and in the glorious possibilities from the action of grace. Hence master and slave, philosopher and road-mender, Roman and barbarian, white man and colored, were all brothers in Christ, all knelt at the same altars. The essential dignity and rights of man and of woman were affirmed to good purpose by Christianity eighteen centuries before they were affirmed to little purpose by the French Revolution. But Christianity preached no leveling of ranks, no abolition of inequality of conditions; rather it taught that all inequality of rights and authority is from God, that all should be tempered by duty, that all obedience should have responsibility as its correlative or counterpart, that we should acquiesce in the diversity of all manner of gifts as providential, and no more rebel against a man being endowed from his very youth with superior power or superior wealth than against his being endowed with a delicate ear for music, or with keen eyesight, or with a beautiful voice, or with muscular strength

and agility, or with powers of physical endurance, all superior to our own.

And notice as a particular point how Christianity, by the great emphasis it lays on family life, thereby emphasizes inequality; for the family is the main ground of inequality. To support wife and children and provide for them after death is the main ground of industry and frugality. Hereditary capacities alike and hereditary weakness are handed on from parent to child no less than hereditary property. Hence, although Collectivism may profess to do no injury to family life, it is in essential contradiction to it by removing its main ground, the devoted union of man and woman for the welfare and advancement of their children.

Let me add one more remark on this argument from justice. Not merely is equality impossible, but I doubt whether it is wanted. Do the Collectivists understand that for the inhabitants of British India, namely, three-quarters of the population of the whole British Empire, the average yearly income per head is £2, according to an official and optimistic account, while other estimates bring it to less than £1 10s. a year, or a penny a day. This being so, if there are any Socialists in this prosperous city of Blackburn, are they prepared to throw in their lot with their fellow subjects of India, and share and share alike, and equalize the scantiness of the one income with the relative abundance of the other? Or will the Socialists of America treat the ten million negroes in the States each as a man and a brother, and become the fellow workmen of a common collectivism? Or will the Australians welcome the Chinese to be as one with them on their almost vacant continent?

So much for the first great support of Collectivism, the

argument from justice. The second argument, from economy, equally fails on examination. I well recognize indeed the waste under our present system, and believe half of it might be avoided. I fully approve of collective ownership and collective working within limits, in reason, up to a certain point, the exact point being a question of circumstances. The post, the telegraphs, the supply of water, gas and electricity, the tramways, seem to me in most places to be best in public, not private, hands; add for India and Ireland the railways, waterways, and forests. In each case the limits of this Collectivism can be discussed; but in all cases its character is totally different from the omnivorous Collectivism that would swallow up every kind of capital, and leave the private man nothing at all. And observe particularly that Collectivism in moderation is not the smallest step towards the Collectivism of the Socialists. You might as well say that to use butter as part of our diet is a step towards eating nothing else. Collective ownership as an ingredient of social diet is wholesome, but as the exclusive diet is fatal.

OBSTACLES TO COLLECTIVISM

Now, briefly, for you can find the details in the excellent joint book of Fathers Cathrein and Gettelmann, there are five fatal difficulties in the way of this universal, all-absorbing Collectivism.

First is the difficulty of organization. Either all the productive property of Great Britain would be worked from one centre as one business, keeping work and wages uniform; and this plan would break down instantly by the pure overweight of clerk-work; or else local autonomy would be granted to parish, urban district, county or

municipality; and then, though the work might possibly be within manageable proportions, there would be other difficulties. For gradually, according to local varieties of opportunity, talent and luck, inequalities of wealth would develop among the different localities, Blackburn, perhaps, be earning 25 per cent. more than Preston; and back comes the inequality that was supposed to have been banished. Nor can this be remedied by allowing labor to flow where it was best paid. For to work the Collectivist plan at all, there must be some fixity in the numbers of the hands to work and the mouths to feed. To provide employment or to cater for ever-fluctuating numbers would be impossible. The present liberty of moving about would in consequence have to be restricted. Even to migrate no further than from Manchester to Liverpool would require a special permit, and we should find ourselves chained to the soil or to the municipal workshop. This I call something like serfdom.

Secondly comes the difficulty of supply. Instead of a body of traders to cater for the public taste you would have as your providers a body of officials eager to get through their work and not be bothered by individual peculiarities. There must be barrack-room uniformity if the Collectivist scheme is to work, no genuine liberty of consumption, not for the men only, but even for their mothers and sisters, their wives and daughters. This I call something like despotism.

Thirdly comes the difficulty of employment. Who is to do what? It would in practice be impossible to allow freedom to choose or to change an employment. We should have to take what was given to us and stick to it. This I call something like slavery. Or if the attempt was made to be fair by causing all men to take turns at work-

ing in different trades, then the waste of human power by thus undoing the division of labor and the increase of annoyance and discomfort would far exceed all the losses and waste of the present competitive system.

Fourthly comes the difficulty of wages. Either all must receive alike, skilled and unskilled, physician and farm laborer, all ranks of workers in the iron, the cotton, or the building trades, to the utter discouragement of skill and intelligence; or else there must be discrimination, some receiving more, others less, with no standard to go by. A municipality now can pay according to current local wages or trade union rates; but under Collectivism there would neither be trade unions or any outside wages with which to make a comparison. And thus we should have to do the very thing we should wish to avoid, and entrust our good fortune to the arbitrary decision of government officials. This I call wages at Bumble's discretion.

Lastly comes the difficulty of motives, and a blow struck at industry, care and frugality. True that Socialists often argue from the natural goodness of man and his proneness to virtue from his youth up. But this appears a contradiction. If man is naturally so good and yet the world so full of injustice and oppression as the Socialists maintain, then the fact that they have allowed the world to drift into so bad a condition proves that mankind, however honest and well-meaning, is thoroughly incompetent, and quite unfit to be trusted with collective management. Let us then confine the argument to real historical man, who appears an idle, careless, and self-indulgent personage unless properly trained and given an adequate motive for action. Take away the stimulus of hope and fear, especially when ennobled

and fortified by regard for others, for infirm parents, for invalid brethren, for wife and young children, to avert from them suffering and poverty, to procure for them comfort, health, education and ease—let their future be secure, no longer in any way in our hands, and what shall save those hands from being smitten with a paralyzing slackness?

So, then, these five difficulties in the way of Socialism —the difficulty of organizing business, of supplying wants, of assigning employment, of adjudicating reward, and of furnishing a motive for industry and frugality— these five fatal difficulties pull down the second prop of Socialism, the argument from economy. There would, no doubt, be some saving in the waste of competition; but the losses would outbalance the saving more than a hundredfold! This I call being penny wise and pound foolish.

SOCIAL REFORM, NOT SOCIALISM, THE NECESSITY

But there still remains the third prop of Socialism, the argument from necessity, that at all costs we must be freed from the evils of the present time, that anything is better than to leave things as they are. And most truly the evils are terrible and pressing; the miserable dwellings of so large a number of our people in town and country, the cruel advantage taken of weak, unorganized labor, the uncertainty of employment, the frequent triumph of dishonesty, the poverty-stricken old age that for so many is the dreary prospect ahead. But who recognized these evils more clearly than Pope Leo XIII? Who told us more clearly than he that we are not to leave these things as they are? What a fallacy,

then, for the Socialists to say Society is sick, and therefore the only remedy is Collectivism, as though there was no other alternative. But another alternative there is that involves no injury to the Church, no injury to the State, no injury to family life, another alternative that, unlike Collectivism, is free from the five fatal obstacles I have shown in the way of Collectivism; and this other alternative is Christian Social Reform.

AN ALTERNATIVE

I have already mentioned Bishop Stang's volume on Socialism and Christianity, and will gladly follow his example of not meeting the new social gospel with mere negation, but with a positive program of reform. I ask, therefore, and with the more confidence because I have an episcopal flag flying at my mast-head, whether in Great Britain we cannot unite our forces and follow social reform along the four lines of protected labor, of organized labor, of insured labor, and lastly of diffused ownership. This is not indeed all, but all that we need now consider.

LABOR REFORMS

As to *protected labor* or factory legislation, we have only to go on with what has been so well begun, and extend, improve, complete and copy any salutary examples from abroad. Thus the laws might be imitated that demand guarantees for the moral character of foremen, separation of the sexes, consent of parents or guardians before those under age may be employed. Then the actual law might be better enforced, and evasions stopped

like those in the dressmaking trade, brought to public knowledge in Mrs. Lyttelton's play. And legal protection should be extended to the helpless crowd of workers, mostly young women, in the match factories, jam-making, and cheap clothing trade.

Secondly, along the line of *organized labor,* let us aim at the spread, the elevation, and the legal incorporation of trade unions, so that as far as possible in all industries all bargaining about work and wages may be collective bargaining, masters and men both organized, all disputes that conciliation cannot avert being conducted before a reasonable tribunal of arbitration, and an end made of the present scandalous uncertainty of the law regarding trade unions.

And here let me interpose a word suggested by what has already passed at this Conference. His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster alluded to a rumor that labor organizations were being abused to force their members to support non-religious education. If there is any truth —I hope there is not—in such a rumor, far from setting Catholics against trade unions, it should stimulate them to take such a friendly and sympathetic attitude towards them in the legitimate industrial sphere as to be able to protest with good effect if they go beyond that sphere. And here precisely is a case to which the words of Father Gerard apply, delivered in this hall last night, on the responsibility of Catholic men; a case where the resolute protest of all Catholic trade-unionists against the organization of labor being thus turned from its proper purpose would have, on all concerned, the most beneficial effect.

Thirdly, along the line of *insured labor* we have an instalment in the Workman's Compensation Act of 1897.

But this only touches accidents and not the other great branches of workmen's insurance, against sickness, against infirmity, and against unemployment. Our trade unions and our friendly societies, for the select portion of our people, serve as insurance against sickness and infirmity; but I confess to a feeling of envy at the magnificent system of triple insurance that is the boast of Germany. But neither in Germany nor elsewhere is the final branch of insurance, viz., that against unemployment, yet established, though attempts have been made, the most conspicuous and practical for us being the great work of our English trade unions, who have spent on unemployed benefit in the twelve years ending 1903 considerably over four million pounds. And I agree with the suggestion in Mr. Percy Alden's recent admirable work ("The Unemployed," pp. 64, 65), that a government contribution should be given in proportion to the sums thus voluntarily subscribed.

DIFFUSED OWNERSHIP

Lastly, we come to the fourth line of true social reform, namely, diffused ownership, on which Leo XIII laid such stress: that the majority of the people should not live merely from hand to mouth, but should have, each family, its small capital, some partnership, shares, or stocks, but principally a small plot of mother earth, from the size of a garden to the size of a small farm, that no creditor could touch, that belonged to the family rather than the individual, that would be greatly eased of local and Imperial taxation and of legal charges (it is done in Belgium), that would serve as insurance against unemployment, that would solve (and alone solve) the

problem of the exodus from country villages, and would allay the complaint of physical degeneration. And if I envy the Germans their insurance laws, I envy still more their millions of peasant proprietors, who, far from dwindling away, as the Socialists and some economists had prophesied, not only weathered the storm of low prices and agricultural depression, but have increased in recent years both absolutely and in the proportion of the cultivated land which they hold. True, in this country we have special difficulties in the way of the endowment, or, rather, the re-endowment, of half our population with property; but with the will there is the way: the extension of allotments, the movement towards rural factories and garden cities are movements in the right direction; and we are gradually shaking off the baleful superstition that the money lender, the company promoter, the credit draper, the army contractor, the drink seller, the slum owner, and others, have a sacred right to make what contracts they please, to pocket what profit they can, and devour the hard-earned savings of genuine labor.

But I have said enough for our purpose, that social reform along the lines of protected labor, organized labor, insured labor, and diffused ownership sweeps away the only remaining defense and last prop of Socialism, its alleged necessity.

A FINAL WARNING

Yet one word of caution in conclusion. I have spoken with great approval of many social reforms. But there is a corrosive poison that eats away the value of them all. This poison is irreligion, whether instilled by godless schools, or godless homes, or godless professors. Thus

the very Germany that among the great countries of the world leads the vanguard of social reform, is herself afflicted with the gravest social discontent; and America, with all her wonderful resources, is beginning at last to recognize, let us hope before it is too late, that for modern nations even temporal welfare is bound up inseparably with Christian schools and Christian homes.

CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A.

Plain Words on Socialism*

I.

MEANINGS OF THE WORD SOCIALISM

The word Socialism in these days sends a thrill through an audience, exciting in them feelings, according to their antecedents, either of hope or abhorrence, there being few to whom Socialism does not sound either as a message of good things to come, deliverance from the evil things of the present—from oppression, humiliation, anxiety, penury—or else as the sinister message of revolution, the destruction of all we value most, the destruction of order, property, peace, country, home and religion.

This being so, it is obvious that I must make clear what is meant by the Socialism about which I am speaking, so that I may not be praising or blaming one thing, and my readers praising or blaming another.

Thus, I will say at once that the Socialism I am here discussing does not mean that all goods are to be held in common, no distinction of families recognized, and no private property; that the rich are to be deprived at once of all their possessions, that all men are to be equalized, and no hierarchy of rank and employment allowed any longer—such a picture of Socialism would be a caricature. Or again, that an orderly State is to disappear and be replaced by independent groups of producers—such a condition would be Anarchism, not Socialism. Or again,

*A lecture delivered in the Oddfellows' Hall, Edinburgh, on February 20, 1906, and published by the C.T.S. of Scotland.

that landed property alone should be nationalized, not other forms of productive capital—such a plan would be an understatement of the Socialist position, no less inaccurate than the previous overstatements. Nor, again, will I make use of wide descriptions that would include Socialism truly enough, but would include a good deal besides, such a description, *e.g.,* as "the political harmony of the suffering classes," or "doctrines that claim a greater equality of social conditions to be obtained by the State or legislation" or "the movement towards the co-operative organization of society." Any social reformer might thus describe his schemes, though they had little or nothing in common with genuine Socialism.(1)

NEED OF CLEAR SPEAKING IN THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION

And it is all the more necessary to say this in view of the recent political events in Great Britain. For two classes of people are desirous of confusing the real issue, confusing the real character of Socialism, making all outlines indistinct, so as to draw to their side, under false pretenses, a great body of people who would never dream of following them unless they were half-blinded in the cloud of dust raised for their mystification.

The two extreme parties on either side are eager for different reasons to identify the Labor Party with the Socialists. On the one hand, the extreme Individualists, those who are opposed to social reform, who detest workmen's combinations, and who refuse to recognize the in-

(1) See Section I of the treatise on *Socialism,* by Victor Cathrein, S.P., translated from the 8th German edition, with additions on America, by V. F. Gettelmann, S.J., New York, 1904.

dissoluble connection between riches and responsibility, between authority and accountability, desire to depict all serious social reform as mere steps on the road to Socialism. So a leading London paper in the first excitement of the elections quoted long passages from the *Clarion*, and from Mr. Robert Blatchford, its editor, in order to identify labor with Socialism, and to discredit, not the Socialists, who were already sufficiently disliked by its readers, but the cause of social reform that wished to secure private property by limiting the abuses of it. So another London paper, writing for the same public, summed up the result of the elections as the "Victory of the Socialists," and declared that "the new Labor Party is essentially Socialistic in aim and character." And so also, though with a different ultimate end, the *Labor Leader* (December 15, 1908) made a similar identification, denounced John Burns as a backslider, included artfully in its Socialist program many items that belong equally to the programs of non-Socialists, and, by a curious inconsistency, while denouncing monopolies, claimed for Socialism the monopoly in this denunciation. And the *Clarion* published an article with the title, "The Socialist Triumph," using almost the very same words as its extreme opponent.

DISTINCTION OF SOCIALISM FROM SOCIAL REFORM

Now, nothing could be further from my purpose than to engage in a political discussion between Liberal and Conservative, to accuse one side of seeking the confiscation of property or the other side of refusing its rectification, or to put in a claim that the one side or the other is the true friend of property.

But my purpose is to make as clear as possible the audacious fallacy that identifies Socialism with social reform. Let us, then, go to the root of the matter, and fasten our attention on what is the distinguishing mark, the characteristic feature of Socialism, the vital point on which Karl Marx and the various schools of his successors agree (though differing in minor points), the Socialism of Bebel in Germany, of Jaurès in France, of Vandervelde in Belgium, and of Ferri in Italy; the Socialism that is common in Great Britain alike to the Clarion Fellowship Clubs, to the Socialist Party of Great Britain, with the *Socialist Standard* their organ; common to the newspaper, *Labor Leader,* and to the Social Democratic Federation; common in the United States to the older Socialistic Labor Party and the new Socialist Party.(1)

All these organizations are so far united that they possess in common the doctrine and the aim that the production and distribution of goods shall be organized by the whole society collectively, and as a necessary preliminary to this, that all the means of production, distribution and exchange shall pass from private ownership to ownership that is public or collective. Hence the term Collectivism is sometimes applied to this sense of Socialism; and in the present lecture I shall use the terms Socialism and Collectivism as meaning the same thing. Thus, in contrast to what is sometimes called old-fashioned, pre-scientific, sentimental, or Utopian Socialism, the newer Collectivism is proclaimed as modern scientific Socialism; and the position attributed to Charles Darwin in regard to biology, namely, that his teaching is

(1) See the section in Cathrein-Gettelmann on "The Present State of Socialism."

to receive certain modifications in detail, but must be accepted in principle, is just like the position attributed to Karl Marx in economics, that a fundamental reconstruction of society is required, and that the State is to be the universal employer.(1) A man is not a genuine Socialist unless he agrees to what the Socialist Party of Great Britain officially express as their object: "The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by, and in the interests of, the whole community."(2) To this I think the brilliant and cautious advocate of Socialism, Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., can raise no objection as expressing his aim "to create the organic order of the Socialist State out of the atomic chaos of the present day." And he declares that "monopoly in land and the use of industrial capital for individual profits . . . must . . . be supplanted by public ownership and production for use, before labor can enter into enjoyment of the blessings which an efficient method of wealth-production makes possible."(3)

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, then, is a genuine Socialist. He is the editor of *The Socialist Library,* in which have appeared or are promised the four great Socialist writers of four different countries, Ferri, Jaurès, Vandervelde, and Bernstein. But in the efforts to support Socialism Mr. MacDonald falls into one of the three great Socialistic fallacies, namely, sophistry or dust-throwing, playing with words, in particular, using the word Socialism

---

(1) See Enrico Ferri, *Socialism and Positive Science,* pp. 11, 12 (*The Socialist Library,* vol. i).
(2) *Socialist Standard,* November, 1905.
(3) *Socialism and Society,* p. 129.

in two totally different senses, one the sense of Collectivism, already explained to you, and the only sense in which I use Socialism here, the other the sense of any legal measures to promote the material welfare of the more numerous classes. In this second sense the reforms urged by Lord Shaftesbury, the great promoter of the factory laws, in the earlier part of the nineteenth century, and by Leo XIII in the latter part, would be called Socialistic, and Lord Shaftesbury and Leo XIII would both of them be called Socialists. Better use no words at all than use them so misleadingly. Thus it is misleading when Mr. MacDonald tells us at the present moment all that the Socialists need do is to lay down and defend as a general principle that reward for work should be certain and sufficient, and that full opportunity should be given to each adult to work at some remunerative employment."(1)

This general principle is one on which social reformers are agreed, and are striving in many countries to carry into practice, social reformers who are wholly averse to Collectivism. Again, he rightly points out how in many towns in certain trades, *e.g.,* the boot and shoe and hosiery trade, a movement is "going on which will end in the transformation of women and girls into the breadwinners of the family, and of men and boys into casual laborers or habitual loafers."(2) But then, by an audacious misrepresentation, he tells us that all well-meaning people, always excepting the Socialists, declare this great evil to be inevitable. But such helpless and hapless acquiescence in evil is just what no social reformer worthy of the name would endure, and a vast body of men every

(1) *Socialism and Society,* pp. 182-3.
(2) *Ibid.,* pp. 183-4.

whit as alive as the Socialists to the evils of our society, every whit as eager to remedy them, are seeking some practical remedy, not an impractical Utopia. Then, in the same misleading fashion, again and again, the case is presented as if no one else besides the Socialists took any heed of industrial evils, and as if there was no choice between Socialism, on the one side, and unchristian Individualism on the other, the brutal application of "business principles" during six days of the week with cant on the seventh day, no choice except reckless competition, the unregulated clash of individual interests on the one side and Socialism on the other. Naturally, any humane man, if this was the alternative, and if there was no other choice, would choose Socialism rather than such a brutal struggle for existence.

THE TRUE MIDDLE WAY BETWEEN SOCIALISM AND INDIVIDUALISM

Such an alternative might have seemed plausible in mid-nineteenth century at the time of the Chartists, but is not plausible now, since for more than fifty years "business principles" of self-regarding individuals have been checked, pruned, amended by the two great forces of combination and legislation; a whole code of elaborate factory laws have grown up, backed by sanitary laws, merchant-shipping laws, and workmen's compensation laws; and a network of trade unions and friendly societies of all sorts (one of the newest and most practical being the Tenant Owner Societies, under the guidance of the Cooperative Housing Council) has simultaneously grown up, and has reached such an extent that, for example, the British Cooperative Societies comprise, if we include

wives and children, some eight million souls, not to speak of the vast accumulated funds and the annual trade of some ninety million pounds. The true line of social reform is to extend and improve the good we have in our hands, such as this vast fabric of cooperation, to improve the factory laws, to give a great extension and amendment to workmen's insurance, to recognize legally trade unions with their two million adherents, to build up body after body, organization after organization, within the State, bind them in mutual relations, spread on all sides the principles of conciliation and arbitration; in short, to use what we have tried and found effective, and not to trust to the untried Utopia of Collectivism. Put in force the teaching of the late Pope's Labor Encyclical, that the State is bound to prevent usury, monopoly, overwork, underpay, that workmen's associations in a variety of forms are not merely to be permitted, but zealously promoted, that as far as possible small owners of property, especially peasant proprietors, are to be multiplied, that all the organs of conciliation are to be strengthened, and all classes and conditions of men to join in the work of social reform, not one only, but *all;* work and prayer, the organized State and the organized Church, the private employer and the private philanthropist, associations of employers and associations of employed working in cooperation—put all this in force, adopt this gospel of peace, and we shall not need the gospel of social war.

A CATHOLIC BISHOP'S PROGRAM.

And to render more effective what I have said on there being a fruitful and practical alternative to Socialism, let me give you a few extracts from a book entitled "Socialism and Christianity," published last year in America by

one of much experience and knowledge of his subjects, Dr. Stang, the Catholic Bishop of Fall River, Massachusetts. I quote from the chapter that bears the excellent title, "Not Socialism, but Social Reform": "The State should not only protect private ownership as something sacred and inviolable, but its policy should be to induce as many people as possible to become owners. . . . The workingman should be encouraged to acquire land and put up his own home on it. A man will take more interest in land which is his own than in property which belongs to another. He will anxiously cultivate the ground he owns until it yields him an abundance of good things that foster his health and rejoice his heart. He will cling to the spot and make it his home, dearer to him than foreign lands and gilded palaces. The possessor of the poorest cabin will not change it for the dreams of a Socialistic paradise. Ownership is one of the greatest boons of human life. The social question of the day is a question of home."(1) Again: "The employer has no right to say to the workingman, 'I can give whatever wages I please; if you are not satisfied with what I offer you can seek employment elsewhere.' He cannot deprive the workingman of his proper and just share in the product. . . . We believe with John Mitchell [a Trade Unionist leader] that every man should have enough to keep his family, educate his children, and lay a little aside for the future. Six hundred dollars a year is the least that should be paid the unskilled common laborer. . . . I think every man should have a house with at least six rooms. He should have a bathroom, a parlor, dining room, kitchen, and enough bed-

(1) *Socialism and Christianity*, pp. 50, 51.

rooms for decency and comfort. He should have carpets, pictures, books, and sufficient furniture to make his home comfortable and bright. He should have good food and should keep his children in school, and at the same time should be able to lay aside something for old age and sickness."(1) Again: "Labor has the same right as capital to organize and unite. . . . The advance of Trade Unions in the United States is not to be dreaded as an evil. It is daily growing more self-conscious and prudent."(2) "Unionism has to be recognized and respected."(3) W. H. Sayward, of Boston, speaking from the side of the employers, says, "My experience has convinced me that labor thoroughly organized and honestly recognized is even more important for the employer than for the workmen. It makes possible a working method between the two parties, which removes, one by one, the most dangerous elements of conflict and misunderstanding."(4) "If Unionism is crushed, Socialism will thrive in its stead."(5)

Let me cite from Dr. Stang yet one more passage: "A sound insurance system, indemnifying not only against accidents, but against reverses of life, such as sickness, loss of work, old age, would give the laboring classes what at the present they need the most—security of existence—and would keep them from drifting into Socialism. Legislation should force such an accident insurance upon any business concern where machinery is employed."(6)

---

(1) *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 57.
(2) *Socialism and Christianity*, p. 63.
(3) *Ibid.*, p. 65.
(4) *Ibid.*, p. 66.
(5) *Ibid.*, p. 68.
(6) *Ibid.*, p. 70.

Thus we find this American Catholic Bishop praising the aspirations of the working classes for a more cultivated life, urging the equipment of every workingman's family with family property, demanding fair wages and the decencies of life for all, and workmen's insurance, and praising workmen's associations, that far from being an injury to the employers, are almost the condition of their security. You may not all agree with the whole program of Bishop Stang, indeed, I hesitate myself before his high standard of house accommodation, but you will allow it is well worthy of our attention.

TRADE UNIONS TO BE WELCOMED

Further, let me repeat a phrase in it as affecting our present circumstances in Great Britain: "If Unionism is crushed, Socialism will thrive in its stead." These words seem to me very wise, and a warning to those among us who with untimely timidity are hostile to Trade Unions. Thus in America Mgr. Spalding, the friend of the Unions, has sorrowfully to recognize the evil that Socialists enter into them and seek to rule them, causing disorder, promising Utopias, and victimizing the workmen by deception. But this is no wonder, because America, as you know, is where the forces of organized capital have sought to break the Unions by vast free labor agencies, by blacklisting, by the use of armed mercenaries, by the misuse of the laws of conspiracy which the employers in combination can themselves evade. Moreover, in America the constitutional law of free contract has been so interpreted as to hamper alike the Factory Acts and Trade Unions; a sympathetic strike has been held to be illegal, and statutes have been declared uncon-

stitutional if they forbade the discharge of a workman for belonging to a Trade Union; similarly, laws forbidding the truck system or commanding weekly payment of wages have been set aside as unconstitutional.(1) The cry, "Down with Unionism!" awakens as its echo the cry, "Up with Socialism!" The same thing happens in Germany. There the liberty of workmen's associations is limited and precarious; they lack cooperative rights; they require a license from the local authorities, are at the mercy of local officials, and are strictly bound to keep to specific questions of work and wages, else are liable to the penal law. And in Germany a vast proportion of the working classes are avowed Socialists, and from the great Social Democratic Party against which Count Buelow, the head of the Emperor's Government, urges all the other parties to join in alliance as against public enemies.

And here in Great Britain the friendliness towards Trade Unions in the early seventies that I remember has given way to the old suspicion and dislike, and instead of welcoming these great organized bodies, of linking them up with the law and the State (so well done in New Zealand and Australia), or of using them as an invaluable ally in the campaign against unemployment, the hostility to them culminated in the Taff Vale decision, virtually, though not nominally, the repeal of an Act of Parliament that had been passed in their favor. No wonder they have been driven into the arms of the Socialists; no wonder that many of their members have become Socialists in reality, and many more, blinded by the dust, have become Socialists in name.

(1) See the small volume, *Our Benevolent Feudalism*, by the Socialist, W. J. Ghent, New York, 1902.

SO-CALLED MUNICIPAL SOCIALISM AS AT GLASGOW

The confusion has been made worse, the mystification of the working classes on the one side and of the rich ratepayers on the other side, has been made completer by the current use of the term "Municipal Socialism." No doubt, in recent years in Great Britain we can trace a vast increase of the economic functions of town councils, and a great many services have been undertaken having the public benefit as their aim, where these services, if left in private hands, would necessarily result either in great waste or in a great monopoly, or where, from the difficulties of exacting payment, private enterprise would have left them unsupplied. Such, for example, as the service of water, of gas, electricity, tramways, markets, docks, public baths, public gardens, public libraries, lodging-houses, and workmen's dwellings. This increase of function is partly due to the fact that British municipalities in mid-nineteenth century had lost much of their ancient powers, and left much either undone or done by private individuals that was habitually done by the municipalities on the European continent. The change was also partly due to the fact that the growth of towns and population rendered common action more and more needful for public health and convenience. But to call this movement Socialism is to play with words. It has been carried out not by any Socialist majority, sometimes not with any Socialist help, in no place as a step towards Collectivism; but simply because it seemed in each particular case for the general good.(1)

In fact, the question of public control and ownership

(1) P. Verghaegen, *Socialistes Anglais,* ch. xi.

is eminently a practical question, varying with times and circumstances, sometimes more, sometimes less—less, for example, where, as in the United States, there is a lack of well-trained and incorruptible officials; more, for example, in Prussia, where such officials can be found, and people are accustomed to the obedience of military and bureaucratic discipline.

Or, to come nearer home, the city of Glasgow is an example of a locality where there was a wide field for the action of the civic authorities, and where the field had been occupied with wonderful energy and success; so that when, in 1901, the British Association held its meeting at Glasgow, strangers to the city could enjoy the best water supply in the kingdom, the cheap municipal gas and municipal trams, the parks, public halls and art gallery; could examine the famous model lodging-houses, public baths, municipal laundries and markets; could read of the immense improvement in the sanitary conditions of the city, with a great diminution of the death-rate, the diminution being the happy result of the new water supply, the better drainage, the clearance of slum areas, and the provision of healthy dwellings.

So great an extension of municipal activity caused Glasgow to be styled in the South the Mecca of Municipal Socialism;(1) though I must remark, by way of protest against this term, that the difference is hardly greater between the climate of the city on the Clyde and the climate of Mecca than the difference between the municipal activity of Glasgow and real Socialism.

And, lest you should think there is anything either new or revolutionary, or, again, anti-Catholic in this kind of

(1) *The Times,* August 23, 1901.

public ownership and control, which is miscalled Municipal Socialism, listen to three examples. One is from Italy in the thirteenth century, in what was then the great industrial town of Siena. The statutes of the town administration can be read to-day; elaborate rules on street cleanliness, market cleanliness, drainage and paving, for the problem of the water supply, for the planting of waste places around the town with trees, for forestry on the communal property; care for the supply of the city with flour and grain, and provisions in general, and building materials, lest the supply be disturbed by any extortionate middlemen. There was power to make street improvements, and assessment was based on the principle of betterment (that, you see, is no new discovery). Finally, besides care for the roads and bridges, this Sienese republic took in hand the medicinal baths in its territory, and fixed a tariff, not merely for the baths but for the lodging of those who frequented them.(1)

Take another Catholic city, this time contemporary, the city of Vienna, under its admirable burgomaster, Dr. Lueger. The city and its suburbs lay under the yoke of a ring of monopolists (chiefly Jews); the peasant cultivators around had to sell the produce of their farms, gardens and vineyards to these monopolists at a very low price, and the consumers had to buy them from these monopolists at a very high price. Dr. Lueger worked a transformation. He undertook a communal restaurant in the vast basement of the town hall, where wholesome and cheap provisions and light wines were sold to immense crowds of all classes, to the great gain both of consumer and producer, by getting rid of the monopolist

(1) See E. Armstrong. *English Historical Review*, vol. xv, 1900

middlemen, and bringing, besides, some £16,000 a year into the municipal treasury. Moreover, water has been municipalized and supplied at very low prices, I believe below cost price; an excellent tram service is supplied just at cost price, while gas and electricity have also been made municipal, and, though supplied very cheaply, yield an annual revenue to the city of about £80,000 sterling. These are great results, and no wonder the great man who has brought them about has been assailed with vituperation. As a Catholic and the friend of Leo XIII and Pius X, Dr. Lueger is called ultramontane, fanatical and retrograde. We are accustomed to such epithets, and can take off the discount from such charges; where I want you to deduct the discount is when you hear him called an Anti-Semite or Jew-hater, because it happened that the monopolists he overthrew were mostly Jews, and when you hear him called a Socialist because he established municipal industry in a field where it was fit.(1)

As a third example, let us come back to our own country and hear what was the condition of the tenants of the great monastery of Durham in the 15th century, a condition that if seen in working order to-day might be miscalled "Village Socialism." The villagers, though nominally tenants, were practically small property owners paying a rent-charge to the monastery. In the village, to quote the words of Abbot Gasquet, "many of the things that in these days advanced politicians would desire to see introduced into the village community of modern England, to relieve the deadly dullness of country life, were seen in Durham and Cumberland in full working order in pre-Reformation days. Local provisions for

(1) See *Rivista Internazionale,* November, 1903, pp. 490, 491.

public health and general convenience are evinced by the watchful vigilance of the village officials over the water supplies, the care taken to prevent the fouling of useful streams, and stringent by-laws as to the common place for washing clothes, and the times for emptying and cleansing ponds and milldams. Labor was lightened and the burdens of life eased by cooperation on an extensive scale. A common mill ground the corn, and the flour was baked into bread at a common oven. A common smith worked at a common forge, and common shepherds and herdsmen watched the sheep and cattle of various tenants, when pastured on the fields common to the whole village community."(1)

IMPRACTICABILITY OF SOCIALISM.

If I have given these details at such length it is to emphasize my contention that reform is not Socialism, and that to mix them up is to confuse, confound, bewilder, and blind with dust or fog, and justifies me in applying to Socialism the epithet *insidious*, because masquerading under false colors as if it were the sole remedy for social ills, when out of many proposed remedies it is merely one.

And now I have as a second point to say that it is a very bad remedy, and thus that it is not merely insidious but *impracticable*.

The collective ownership and collective management of all the means of production implies that every factory and workshop in a whole country, every warehouse, every retail shop, every office, and every house of business, all ships from a liner to a fishing smack, every mine and

(1) Preface to his edition of Cobbett's *History of the Reformation*, p. xiv, 1896.

quarry belong to the Government, and must be managed by those who are working, not on their own account, but as Government servants.

Again and again the difficulties (seemingly insuperable) have been pointed out, and some explanation or answer demanded from the Socialists how they could be overcome. Already on other occasions I have pointed out that these difficulties, for the purpose of remembering them better, can be reduced to five: first, the difficulty of organizing work; secondly, the difficulty of supplying different wants; thirdly, the difficulty of assigning different employments; fourthly, the difficulty of assigning remuneration; and lastly, the difficulty of supplying a stimulating motive to work.

DIFFICULTIES OF ORGANIZATION.

First, regarding the difficulty of organizing work, take Scotland alone, with something less than five million inhabitants. Think of all the houses of business in Edinburgh and other great towns and in every village and hamlet, worked from one centre. You may say it is done now by the post office. Precisely, because the post office performs a simple service where the prime matter is delivery, and the prime economy is to avoid cross delivery; it is a simple, almost mechanical work; the main work, the letters themselves, are produced by the individual thousands of the public. It would be a more apt comparison if an agent of State were himself, after hearing the individual circumstances, to write every letter and to post them at the proper time, just as he now transmits and delivers them. And in the Socialist Commonwealth the many busy hands that are now conducting tens of thou-

sands of businesses, lesser or greater, throughout the land, and in most cases occupy their position precisely because they are capable, would at best remain as mere agents of a central organizing power. Nor are we helped by the analogy of great trusts or combinations, especially conspicuous in America, where vast industries are controlled by a few men. For apart from the difficulty that it is one thing for *some* industries to be controlled, and quite another thing for *all* industries to be controlled, there remains this difficulty, that as far as great combinations and trusts have been successful, they have been successful because great power and great wealth have been *permanently* concentrated in few hands, and a new baronial or feudal system has been reconstituted; only instead of lordly barons in their castles we have great financial magnates in their counting-houses, sitting enthroned there, not for a few weeks or few months, but *permanently*. Hence, if there is to be any successful business organization on the scale supposed, the democratic principles of starting fair, of popular control, and of rotation of office, all must be thrown overboard. Not even the world-famous Scottish capacity for business could carry on any concern with success if with every new moon there was to be a new manager. Rather we must hand ourselves over to the tender mercies of rulers and organizers, who must be *few,* who must be *permanent,* who must be *autocratic*.

I have said Scotland—but why Scotland? Why not the forty-five millions of the United Kingdom, or the four hundred millions of the British Empire? Mr. MacDonald speaks of "the community" and of the "nation-making epoch" as if it was closed, and like other

Socialists assumes complete, cut-and-dried and distinct units, that can each form a Socialist commonwealth. For most truly no Socialist organization is possible with shifting frontiers and shifting populations. But the facts are wholly contrary to the assumption that is required by Socialism. Take the last sixty years only: compare the political map and the statistics of population in 1846, and then at each successive ten years look at the changes in both. It would take me several hours to give you a mere catalogue of these changes. Only think, for example, of the extraordinary changes of the political areas ruled from London, from Paris, and from Berlin. Or again, think of the millions of men and women in a twofold vast migration, one from Europe to America, the other from the open country to the towns. And there is no sign that these changes are coming to an end. Frontiers and population are in a state of flux, now no less than sixty years ago, and their uncertainty makes the proposed Socialistic organization of national industry an impossibility. Society would have to be crystallized, frontiers stereotyped, international, nay, even interurban migration stopped, all men confined each to his own district, like serfs in the old time or indentured coolies in the new time.

DIFFICULTY OF SUPPLYING WANTS

Much more could be said on this first difficulty of organization, but I must pass on to the second, the difficulty of supplying different wants. A man's individuality, and let me say still more a woman's individuality, must be sacrificed: there is no room for peculiarities, idiosyncrasies, individual requirements. No doubt the ordinary food, the ordinary clothing, ordinary furniture, or-

dinary houses, ordinary amusements, you could get by presenting a labor ticket at the Government stores, or in whatever way distribution was managed; but all production would be wholesale, on a large scale, after an official pattern; instead of facing a body of producers and sellers eager to cater for every separate want, you would face an official body to whom any fresh want would mean more trouble and more brain work, with no prospect of private profit as an incentive; and thus you would seek in vain to procure what would be out of the routine of Government production; the practical consequence would be that grown men and women would be assimilated to boys or girls at a boarding-school, and we must all be as soldiers with barrack-room uniformity. There could be no genuine liberty of consumption.

DIFFICULTY OF THE ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYMENTS

The third difficulty is the assignment of different employments, and we ask in vain how can it be done? For every one to take turn and turn about at every trade is so appalling a waste of power, so great a violation of division of labor, as to be out of the question; to choose what you like best is to leave undone necessary employments that are liked the least; to give a greater reward to the rough, unpleasant tasks is to depreciate the higher and more delicate tasks: the chimney-sweep or scavenger would get more than the physician or the schoolmaster. A courageous effort to meet these difficulties was indeed made by Edward Bellamy, in his famous novel *Looking Backward;* but I need not dwell on his work, as it has long been repudiated by Bebel, who called him "a Utopian

and no Socialist."(1) Indeed, the Socialist leaders shrink from publishing any practical details of the future Socialist State, and evade practical criticisms by keeping to generalities.(2)

DIFFICULTY OF REMUNERATIVE WORK

And the same may be said of the fourth difficulty, the assignment of remuneration. It is often done very badly now. Social reformers know the evil, and are striving as far as possible to remedy it. But remuneration even now is often done very well. Take, for example, the elaborate rates for piece work in the Lancashire cotton trade, fixed by representatives of masters and men, and arrived at by technically trained experts;(3) or, take the joint agreement that has worked so satisfactorily for five years or more in the coal-mining industries of the four great States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.(4) How could Socialism deal with cases like these? For a little while, indeed, they might simply continue the previous work of conciliatory experts; but any change of production and any invention would make the old standards inapplicable, and no criterion would be at hand for the new, no outside current rates or Trade-Union rates, and all would have to be left to official good pleasure. But no body of men, least of all a body of

(1) *Woman and Socialism,* p. vii, 10th German edition. Stuttgart, 1891. A detailed confutation of Bellamy is given in Cathrein-Gettelmann, pp. 285-287, 320-321, 331 note.

(2) See pp. 233-244 of Cathrein-Gettelmann.

(3) S. and B. Webb, *Industrial Democracy,* 2d ed., pp. 195-204.

(4) W. J. Ashley, *Adjustment of Wages,* 1903. Appendix iv.

officials, are to be trusted with arbitrary power in their hands.

DIFFICULTY OF SUPPLYING A MOTIVE

Lastly, but not least, comes the difficulty of supplying a motive. It has been pointed out, again and again, how unlikely is the order and punctuality, the incessant and strenuous labor, the keen eye for technical improvement, the watch for markets, that is stimulated by the fear of dismissal on the part of the employed, or bankruptcy on the part of the employers, and by the hope of advancement and enrichment on the part of both. But in the Socialist State there could be neither dismissal nor bankruptcy to fear, and the honors and rewards that might be held out to the industrious and inventive would be a shadowy reward compared with the substantial gains that our present social arrangements do not indeed always give (alas! far from it), but at least hold out as an allurement. Hence the universal self-interest of indolent mankind in the Socialist State would condone, not indeed absolute idleness, but habitual slack work, easy-going habits, general negligence, that it would be everybody's business, and therefore nobody's business, to correct.

FAILURE OF SOCIALISTS TO ANSWER THE OBJECTION OF IMPRACTICABILITY

The impracticable character of Socialism having long ago been pointed out, I looked with interest to see whether in either of the two volumes of the Socialist library published in 1905, namely, *Socialism and Positive Science*, a translation from Prof. Ferri, and *Socialism and Society*, by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, any serious attempt was

made to meet this charge of impracticability. There is no serious attempt made in Prof. Ferri's work. In Mr. MacDonald's there *is* an attempt, whether serious you must yourselves judge. I have already shown how this writer —now the Member for Leicester—confuses the issue by making all social reform a step in the direction of Socialism instead of away from it. Now to the many practical objections against the collective ownership of all the lands, and mines, and railways, and dockyards, and ships, and mills, and workshops, he answers: "Make the change by degrees. *Solvitur ambulando,* not *sic volo,* laboratory experiment, not revolution, is the method of Socialism."(1) But how can this be taken, in spite of the Latin quotation, as a serious answer to the objections to Collectivism. If the end is wrong, it is not made right by being reached slowly and piecemeal. If I were to uphold that the best social arrangement was an oligarchy of great trusts, with all the rest of the people their industrial and political subjects, and you raised objections to the working of such a society, would it be a serious answer to say that this arrangement was to be reached cautiously, slowly, and in a Fabian manner? And supposing Mr. MacDonald's phrase "laboratory experiment" is a correct paraphrase of *solvitur ambulando,* are you and I to be stretched on the laboratory table as a *corpus vile* for social vivisection? Is Scotland, with all her great historic memories, is the mighty empire of which Scotland forms one of the most brilliant jewels, are the homes and hearths of the Scottish people, as were they some worthless material, to be exposed to the chances of a dubious experiment?

---

(1) *Socialism and Society,* p. 180.

SOCIALISM IMMORAL AS BEING INJURIOUS TO FAMILY LIFE

I said dubious; but the experiment is worse than dubious, for real Socialism is not merely, as I have shown you, *insidious* and *impracticable,* but is exposed to a third and graver charge of being *immoral,* in the sense of being opposed to that solid family life which is the very pivot of morality and of happiness. No doubt such a charge will be indignantly repudiated; but remember before you join in the repudiation how precisely I have limited genuine Socialism, how carefully I have explained that a vast percentage of those who call themselves, or are called by others, Socialists, deserve not the name, and are striving after something completely different from genuine Socialism. To make a charge against these men, these merely nominal Socialists, of being opposed to family life would be almost as preposterous as to make such a charge against the Pope or the Premier. But Socialism itself, that sets up the State as the universal producer and provider, this is an immoral doctrine, destructive of family life. I know indeed full well that there is much highly injurious to family life in the present condition of things, especially in the work of married women away from their homes, and in the miserable dwellings of so many of our people, for example, the overcrowded tenements of the jute-workers in Dundee, that make the name of "home" a mockery. That, indeed, is a reason why every one of us should be eager for the social reform that will mend or mitigate these evils, but not to mend them by doing away with the very home we are seeking to preserve or restore. And yet this is precisely what Socialism does. The sacred union of man and woman for mutual help, for educating and supporting their children, for providing for their

future welfare, the sense of mutual responsibility and care, the true and healthy communism, that of the home, the countless co-operative associations which each family forms, the thousand ties of dependence that are an occasion for the display of the best qualities of human nature—this realm of self-devotion and self-sacrifice—all this becomes unmeaning and impossible where the Socialist State provides for the nourishment and education and technical training and material and moral outfit of each child. The moral office of parents is gone, the sacred enclosure of home is violated, the sacred words father, mother, brother, sister, have been degraded to a lower meaning, and the next step is to reduce the rearing of man under approved physicians and physiologists and the latest professors of eugenics, to the level of a prize cattle farm. The Christian family and Collectivism are incompatible; their antagonism is so rooted that reconciliation is impossible.

BENEFIT OF SMALL HOLDINGS, AND SOCIALIST HOSTILITY TO THEM

This antagonism is seen in various ways, and first in regard to small properties. Where the mass of mankind live, each family in a separate house with a garden around it, or small holding, or farm that will not occupy habitually much more labor than that of the members of the household—this is the best field for the Christian family; this the historical condition for the soundest family life. Christian and non-Christian, in the past, this the ideal of social reform, this what the new movement in Great Britain towards garden cities is proclaiming, this what Leo XIII, the great exponent of Christian family life and of

the Christian renovation of society, urged so strongly, this the prevalence of which in great parts of Germany and the United States, gives to those two great countries the best security for their greatness.

But against such small properties, against the country-side being dotted with innumerable homesteads, such as still can be seen in parts of Aberdeenshire and among Highland crofters, real Socialism has set itself in persistent hostility, from the days when Karl Marx mistook the future and prophesied the disappearance of peasant proprietors,(1) to the publications of *The Socialist Library* last year, wherein Mr. MacDonald ignores this prime remedy for social disease,(2) and where Prof. Ferri condemns small farms in his biological fashion as rudimentary organs with no function in the higher organization of society.(3) And here you can find a good practical test of the difference on which throughout this paper I have laid such emphasis, the difference between mere nominal or harmless Socialism, on the one side, and real and mischievous Socialism on the other. If a party or writer desires the spread of peasant proprietors, of small farmers, crofters—desires to see a multitude of families, each family working its own ground for its own sustenance, or for a wholesome supplement to its income; then any alleged Socialism of the party or the writer is only nominal and innocuous, like the alleged Socialist legislation of Australasia that has endeavored by the

---

(1) See the facts and figures in Cathrein-Gettelmann, pp. 160, ff. Also on the growth of the peasantry, relatively and absolutely, in Germany, see W. J. Ashley, *Progress of the German Working Classes*, 1904, pp. 60-68.

(2) *Socialism and Society*, p. 170.

(3) *Socialism and Positive Science*, pp. 71, 72.

taxation of unimproved ground values and by other measures, such as the exemption of improvements and of small landowners from taxation, to create as many farmers as possible on the vacant lands, and transform desolate sheep runs into the homes of a thriving peasantry.(1)

But true Socialism is hostile to peasant owners as well as to all owners; the small farm or croft is an instrument of production no less than the mine or factory, and must be absorbed by the community, not left as family property for family benefit. Extremes meet; and Individualism agrees with Socialism in making the individual the unit instead of the family—the individual working for himself, the individual face to face with the all-embracing State, and every power or function of intermediate organs weakened, numbed, often totally paralyzed. And thus the very criticism that has been directed against Individualism is equally applicable to Socialism, that it regards man, to use a famous French saying, as *né enfant trouvé, mort célibataire*—that is, it regards every one as if reared in a foundling house and dying unwedded.

THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN AND ANTI-CATHOLIC CAMPAIGN OF SOCIALISTS

And yet a clearer sign of the incompatibility of genuine Socialism with the Christian family is seen in the hostility of Socialism to Christianity. True, there have been so-called "Christian Socialists" like Maurice or Kingsley; true, there are in England now a large body of men, *e. g.*, many of the Fabian Society and many members of the

(1) See *The Economic Journal,* 1904, pp. 401 ff., on "Taxation of Land Values in Australasia."

Anglican "Christian Social Union," who call themselves both Socialists and Christians. But this is quite a misnomer, considering what I have told you on the confusion of words and the misuse of the term Socialism to express Social Reform, though such a misnomer need not surprise us among our separated brethren, who are without watchful pastors under an infallible head to warn them when they are wandering from the track. And thus the real anti-Christian character of real Socialism comes out much more clearly wherever the Catholic Church is a recognized power. There the two great combatants appear undisguised. So (to repeat what I said at the Blackburn Catholic Conference in 1905), (1) "you have only to cross to Belgium to see them forming two political parties in daily hostility. At least half the blame of the cruel persecution of the Church in France falls on the shoulders of the Socialists. In Germany a strong Government left off persecuting the Church because in her it recognized the only force that could withstand Socialism successfully. In Italy a Government, once bitterly anti-clerical, is becoming eager for an alliance with the Church as a shield against the Socialists. The same antagonism is seen across the Atlantic. The two rapidly growing and spreading bodies in the United States are the Socialists, who already make up nearly half the voters, and over against them the Catholic Church." And this Church the American Socialists well recognize is the great obstacle that bars their way to their final victory.(2)

Nor is it to be passed by without mention that the most

---

(1) Issued as a penny publication by the Catholic Truth Society, under the title *Socialism.*

(2) Stang, *Socialism and the Church,* pp. 15, 33.

conspicuous of all living German Socialists, Herr Bebel, has written a famous book on *Woman*, that has been translated into many languages; a book that sets at nought, not merely the principles of the Christian family, but the very first principles of decent life, and proclaims the abominable doctrine that, by an appalling misuse of two noble words, is called the doctrine of free love.(1) And in England the most violent recent attack on Christianity, nay, on the existence of God and all religious beliefs, has been made in the *Clarion* newspaper of London, edited by Robert Blatchford, who, among English Socialist writers, is perhaps the most widely read.

It is true that in modern England, and probably still more in Wales and Scotland, the irreligious character of real genuine Socialism is veiled by the cloud of that non-genuine kind of which I have spoken so frequently, and which so frequently is profoundly religious. But still, the force of logic is too powerful and too remorseless, the world too closely connected physically and morally for us in England or Scotland to remain insulated much longer, or much longer to combine the incompatible. The fog will lift, the veil will be withdrawn, and you will see the real lineaments of Socialism; its true character, not as seen in its undeveloped infancy in Great Britain, but as seen as an adult in its further development on the Continent and in America. Then it will appear as one aspect or form of modern irreligion, of the doctrine that all that is worth having is to be had in this world, of the revolt against the providential guidance of mankind, the ejection of belief in God and His judgments. Developed Social-

(1) *Dei Frau und der Sozialismus,* 10th edition. Stuttgart, 1891, pp. 337, 338.

ism is but the practical way adopted by the toiling multitudes of expressing their irreligion.

NOT SOCIALISTS BUT ATHEISTS THE REAL CULPRITS AND THE ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE

Am I then, as a conclusion, because of the unchristian and shocking words of Socialists, like Bebel, or Ferri, or Robert Blatchford, to exclaim, *Le Socialisme, voilà l'ennemi!* See in Socialism our arch-foe? By no means; for this would be to mistake agents for principals, to assail the dupe rather than the deceiver. It is not against Socialists, but against others, that we must direct our indignation; namely, against those who sit in high places, and under the plea of philosophy or science or historical criticism whittle away the foundations of our faith, admit no voice of revelation, will not recognize that Christ is God, or even that we know of any real personal God outside ourselves, any Father in heaven—these men are our true foes, these the irreconcilable enemies of the human race. Irreligion sitting at the banquet, clad in purple and fine linen, and Socialism, irreligion's unhappy offspring, too often disavowed, shivering in rags on the doorstep—with which of these shall we feel indignation? Not with the offspring, I trow, but with the parent. And I can spare little pity for the clamorous complaints of rich men stripped of their power and possession by a working man's commonwealth, if they have previously joined in the unholy work of rearing a generation of atheists.

But let no one think that the working men at least will secure a material benefit, though they may lose a spiritual. The sword of irreligion is a treacherous weapon, and woe to those who grasp it, for it will turn against themselves. If the love of God, as Scripture tells us, is impossible

without the love of man, it is no less certain that the love of man—true philanthropy, true altruism—is based on the love of God; unless you recognize God as your Father, you cannot recognize man as your brother. See, then, those who would cast away religion, like the misguided followers in this realm of the *Clarion* and of the Rationalist Press Association, see whither you would be driven. First of all, perhaps, indeed, the property and power of the actual holders might be weakened or swept away; but no reign of love would follow the change. Much rather the bold and crafty, in the new struggle for existence, would secure, like the "bosses" of North America, for themselves and their allies the mastery over production, the control of wealth, the subjection of their fellow-men—the words fellow-men, indeed, or comrades, or brethren, are all out of place; say, rather the subjection of those others who, in the ruthless strife, have shown themselves their inferiors, and who would be made all speedily to know their inferiority, to know their masters, to recognize as their wisest course a ready adaptation to their environment. The new aristocracy, or plutocracy, or capitalists, or magnates, or whatever name was given to the new holders of might and money, these new men would rule without any of the moral restraints that now, imperfectly indeed, but still in some measure, control them; and far from the issue of attempted Socialism being for the good, as true social reform, or true Christian Democracy, is for the good of the poorer and weaker classes of society,(1) the last state of the great masses would be worse than the first.

(1) See the penny publications issued by the Catholic Truth Society on *Christian Democracy before the Reformation* and *The Meaning and Aim of Christian Democracy.*

Therefore, as my final word, alike to those endowed and those not endowed with riches and power, it is not Socialism for the one, it is not Capitalism for the other, that is the foe to be fought, but for both alike the common enemy is Atheism; Atheism is our arch-foe. Among godless property-holders, godless employers, godless workpeople, there can be no lasting accord; alone under the wings of religion can social and domestic peace find a lasting refuge.

C. S. Devas, M.A.

Catholics and the Social Movement*

Human life is continually growing and changing. During the past ten years it has been transforming itself with unprecedented rapidity. Self-consciousness in the individual and the community is intensified. Deficiencies and hardships are revealed which had previously passed unnoticed by the crowd of men. We may personally be content with the measure of comfort enjoyed by ourselves, while the world at large, or one great section of it, is clamoring with discontent. No one here can fail to have made some acquaintance with the elements of this seething dissatisfaction; but not every one will have observed how wide an area has been affected, nor will every one have been aroused to a sense of his own responsibilities under the changing conditions of society. Poverty groans under the very shadow of splendid prosperity, driving, for example, in London one-fourth of its inhabitants to end their days under some form of charity, and burying one-tenth of our whole population below the level of decent human existence. Then there is the problem of the unemployed, chronic with us, and more pressing than in any other country in the world. There are the accumulated and unsuspected horrors of "sweated labor"; there is the agricultural crisis, in which the surviving agriculture of what is now the least agricultural country in the world seems threatened with still further

*A paper read at the Conference of the Catholic Truth Society, at Preston, England, by the Right Rev. Mgr. Parkinson, D.D.

disaster. Recall, too, the ominous warning of our declining birth-rate, and the physical degeneration of so many of our children and young people. You might travel all over Europe without meeting with a parallel of the specimens of pitiable wretchedness you meet on entering cities like Birmingham, Manchester, or Liverpool. The extent and urgency of our social needs are made more apparent by the vast number of societies and agencies of all kinds, both public and private, which the kindliness and ingenuity of men have devised for the purpose of safeguarding and promoting the well-being of those below the poverty-line, or of the large class that lies at the mercy of every fluctuation in the trade of the country. Such, for instance, are clubs, benefit societies, co-operative societies, trade unions, etc. These societies are for the most part conducted with intelligence and devotedness, and in a spirit of willingness to cooperate with others.

Belgium, perhaps, of all nations, has been most keenly alive to the exigencies of the present economic situation, and we meet there a general thriftiness, an old-age pension system working satisfactorily, and a total absence of the "unemployed" problem. France, Germany, Italy, Russia are distracted by social discontent, strikes and Socialism. Our own colonies of Australia and New Zealand have led the way in the illuminative path of the "minimum wage."

As far as the laws of our own country are concerned, we have on the whole the best labor laws in the world; we have a good system of factory inspection, we have legislation determining the liability of employers of labor in case of accidents, we have the provision of breakfasts for famished school children, we are witnesses of the ex-

isting movements in the direction of school hygiene, medical inspection of children, small holdings in the country and housing in the towns. And yet, in spite of all this, our social unrest continues to increase, and expressions of discontent are louder and more frequent than ever.

WHY IS THERE A SOCIAL PROBLEM?

The central point of the whole social question is how to gain a decent living, or how to procure the wherewithal to be properly fed, clothed, housed, educated, and recreated; or, to put it in a single word, the question is one of suitable maintenance. Every individual of our teeming population yearns to live as easily, as comfortably, and as efficiently as the inevitable conditions of human life will permit. Strange though it may seem when thus crudely stated, it is nevertheless true that urban overcrowding, infant mortality, the prevalence of dangerous trades, sweated labor, strikes, child labor, the labor of married women in factories, all emphasize and illustrate this central field of effort—the struggle for higher maintenance.

Whatever may be the remedies proposed to remove or alleviate the misfortunes of our economic state, a broad fact confronts every man and woman who will devote a little patient reflection to the circumstances of human life. This fact is that men, women, and children—individuals and families, all of the same flesh and blood, of the same moral and intellectual capabilities, of the same lofty destiny—live, labor, and die in conditions of life most unequal, where the comforts, the pleasures, or the toils are often unmerited by the individuals who suffer or enjoy them.

TWO OPPOSITE SOLUTIONS

Collectivism boldly declares that the prevailing conditions of life are radically and desperately wrong. Socialists therefore demand a radical and desperate transformation. What now seems to exist for the benefit of the privileged few must be transferred more or less promptly to the less fortunate multitude to possess and enjoy in common with the present unlawful holders. The sources of our common maintenance, the means of production (land, mines, quarries, factories, and plant), as being the natural heritage of the race, are (they allege) unjustly retained in the hands of private individuals. These sources of wealth must become common property. Catholics, on the contrary, affirm that the essential character of the existing social and economic fabric is just and natural, but that for many rasons it has got seriously out of order, but still not so seriously out of order as to be beyond repair.

A WORD ABOUT OUR TERMS

Social movement, in its broadest sense, is an activity of the whole nation; or, taking into account the present swift and easy communication between nation and nation, it is a necessary, simultaneous, and interdependent function of all nations. Social activity can no more be disjoined from other national or international activities than muscular energy can be dissociated from the directive action of the brain, or from the operations of digestion. Still the social movement is neither strictly political nor ecenomic. Politics include, or ought to include, those grand principles and liberties which guard and develop

the life of the city, the family, and the individual. Economics are engaged with values, sales, exchanges, and the distribution of wealth, whether in the form of profits, wages, rent, or interest. Social science to some extent includes all these, or it may be, and in common use is, restricted more particularly to the advancement and protection of the individual, the family, and the city.

UNALTERABLE PRINCIPLES

As the Catholic Church is an institution many centuries old, it has long had definite principles concerning social life and conduct. Individual and social life is eminently the province of Catholic influence and guidance. Now, there are certain principles which with Catholics are axiomatic, and which in practice admit of neither doubt nor discussion. From among these unalterable principles the following may be set forth as applying more directly to the subject in hand:

1. Every man is under the obligation, and has therefore the right, to serve God according to his conscience.

2. He has consequently the right to bring up his offspring in accordance with the tenets of his own religion, and to enjoy all reasonable facilities for its free exercise.

3. Individuals may and do lawfully possess as their own both land and other properties. To deprive them of what they hold by a recognized title of ownership would be spoliation.

4. Every individual has a full and inviolable right to the use and disposal of his own properties, subject only to the extreme necessity of others.

5. Every man has a right to the unfettered use of his

abilities, to self-direction, to the results of his industry and capacity.

Here we have the right to free choice of labor, and the right of reasonable competition.

6. Men, being free agents with high capabilities of development, have an inborn right to such leisure as will allow them to practise their religion, to cultivate the personal and domestic virtues and to improve their minds.

Herein is the foundation of the claim for moderate hours of labor, for the provision, furtherance, or free enjoyment of the means of religious, moral, and social betterment.

SOCIAL ACTION, PHILANTHROPY, AND CHRISTIAN CHARITY

Social action embraces all that in whatever manner promotes the good of the members of a limited group, such as the city, town, village, or district. It may be exercised in administrative work, but its more congenial and characteristic occupation is with those classes of socity who are the more dependent on the help and direction of others, whether in matters pecuniary, religious, or moral. As instances one may refer to associations of various kinds of men, women, boys and girls, and relief agencies of every description.

Philanthropy and Christian Charity may be classed together for our present purpose, though they differ essentially in the principles that animate them. They may also differ in the directness of their action, just as the work of a Sister of Charity or a hospital nurse is more intensely social than that of the millionaire who simply writes out the check for £1,000 as a donation to a public swimming bath.

Should ever social activity become so far-reaching as to do away with the now large proportion of the indigent, or of those who, though not actually in want, are always on the verge of poverty, and at times even submerged, there will be abundant cause for thanksgiving; but for generations to come there will be plenty of scope for the heroic devotedness of all our works of charity. Till all are pure, there will be Magdalen homes; till all are provident and thrifty, there will be rescue work; till a true elixir of life is discovered there will be physical degeneration and hospital work; till all have acquired full self-control and consummate prudence, till all are blessed with invariable good fortune, there will be men, women, and children whose condition will plead to the sympathetic hearts of the wiser or more fortunate.

A PRACTICAL OUTLOOK ON LIFE

Dreamers we must never be. In social and political matters it is easy to mistake dreams for realities. Social and political projects are engaged with the hard realities of life, upon natural laws in full operation, which by taking thought we cannot change. It is easy to imagine human life with certain of its troublesome factors eliminated; but think as you may, the factors are there. They are even increasingly present; to ignore them is to dream.

There cannot be a shadow of doubt that the cooperation of Catholics in the various departments of social enterprise would be welcomed. Neither is there any room for doubt that, from a closer acquaintance with the methods of others, Catholics may learn much with reference to the administration and arrangements of the social works which they themselves have initiated, such

as hospitals, laundries, clubs, recreations, night schools, etc.

THE SOCIAL SENSE

No one can pursue a subject with profit unless he has a taste for it. Now, the taste for social subjects is the "social sense." Our five senses are purely egotistical; the "social sense" is a sympathetic outlook. It apprehends our fellow men as beings, with hearts and aspirations like the best of men. It looks upon the separate individuals, whether they be workmen, servants or casual laborers, as sharers with ourselves in the resources, benefits, and advantages of the present world, in which their lot is often so much harder than our own. It goes out effectively towards them, soothing, enlightening, elevating, comforting, sustaining, civilizing more truly, Christianizing, or bringing them yet closer to the divine embrace. There are those in whom the social impulse to better, to improve, to elevate and invigorate others has never been vividly aroused. Men (they feel) are born into their different stations. Physical and psychological differences, disqualifications, discomforts, heavy or distasteful and unremitting toil are the natural result of these original differences; and so they thank God that they are not as the rest of men. Yet how vast is the army of our toilers; how stern are the conditions of their labor; how pathetic the devotedness of many of them; how resignedly do they, for the most part, put up with difficulties which to many others would be unbearable. And how much of their weary and endless toil is capable of alleviation! Such is the field to which the social worker must bring his heart, his hands, and his intelligence.

The number of workers is on the increase; nor is it any longer an objectionable imputation on a man's gentility that he is busy in civil or commercial affairs. This is a gain. Any one who fails to do his share in promoting the common advantage is an idler. There are social layers of workmen, from the casual or unskilled laborer to the highly educated professional man. We are sometimes misled by the terms "the working" class and the "better" class, but the "better" class is not a section of the community dispensed from its allotted work, but a class which works with less or wholly without economic pressure, or which is engaged upon a higher kind of labor. We must protect ourselves from the time-honored prejudice that labor of a less specialized or more material character is therefore degrading. All honest toil, subservient to natural human purpose and advantage, is honorable. Every man should belong to a working class, and no class is the better because it does less work.

A SPECIMEN OF THE FIELD OF SOCIAL WORK

One only specimen shall be taken from the wide field of social work, which in one way or another is open to the enterprise and industry of all. I instance the endless and varying problem of the remuneration of labor. And let the example be restricted to remuneration in the form of wages. The difference of a few shillings a week in wages means health and comfort or starvation and misery to many millions of our countrymen. The wage problem is not easily solved; but the general principle will not be called in question that the payment given to a man in exchange for his toil should, under ordinary circumstances, be sufficient to maintain him up to a fair

standard of robust, human life. And as human life is dependent upon the life of the family, the standard of maintenance is not the efficiency of the individual worker alone, but of the family he is bound by his position to support. The applications of this principle are innumerable, and the limitations it must receive are many and difficult to deal with; but the substance of the principle is as inviolable as it is far-reaching. A man has a right to live as a man, and not as a beast of burden or a mere instrument of toil. He can live only by the product of his labor; labor must then supply him with the means of a becoming subsistence. Remuneration may be sufficient according to contract, but it may be rendered insufficient by cruel deductions. The wage-earner is always a man. He can never barter away the dignity or privileges of his manhood. The hours of his labor should leave him space for intercourse with his fellows, for the society of his wife and family, for the exercise of his religious duties, and for such bodily and mental recreation as may reasonably be sought for the solace of a life of toil and for the recovery of expended energy. The remuneration of labor should not merely suffice to feed, clothe, house, and cultivate the man, but his family also. As things are now, the child too often begins to support itself before it has done its elementary schooling. School children long for the day when they may leave school altogether to go and earn money in the factory or workshop. The wife herself must work out, because from a child she has done so; and little wonder that she dislikes home work, for she has never had an opportunity of acquiring a taste for the occupations that belong to the realm of wife and mother. Hence flow disastrous consequences

in the state of the home, the care of the children, the instincts of the mother, and the rearing of her offspring.

THE MORAL

We Catholics as such, have a duty to discharge in accepting with alacrity our share in social work. As Catholics, we are men and citizens, and cheerfully recognize the obligations that arise naturally from the two sources of religion and citizenship. As Catholics, we have clear and firm principles to guide us. These principles will encourage earnestness and thoroughness, while they will serve as an effective check to exaggeration. As Catholics, too, we have not invariably taken our full share in public activity. As Catholics, also, we have much to learn from the many excellent forms of civic effort which exist for the alleviation of human suffering or distress, and for the promotion of individual and corporate well-being. As Catholics, we are able to contribute something more than material advantages (such as higher wages, shortened hours of labor, or improved conditions); we offer (as no others can do with the same definiteness) spiritual advantages, without which all the rest have proved to be unsatisfying. An advance in self-consciousness, such as is effected by education, and advance in material comforts and opportunities, such as is afforded by the unmistakable increase in the emoluments and pleasures of the working classes, demand a corresponding advance in moral restraint and religious enlightenment. In default of this spiritual and moral amelioration it has come about that, with an increase of prosperity, there have appeared alarming and almost universal symptoms of unrest and discontent.

At the same time Catholic effort and cooperation will

be ineffective unless it be enlightened. Social and economical life in these days is so infinitely complex that dangers and illusions beset the path at almost every step. A Catholic should carry with him his sense of right and fairness, and a brotherly spirit of true charity. These will safeguard him, though they will by no means exonerate him from the labor of patient investigation and reflective reading. It must be confessed that our English Catholic library of social manuals has yet to be written. Good work, but limited in extent, and not highly specialized, has been done by English Catholics, while much excellent work in all branches has been done in France, Belgium, and Germany. What we want is a series of cheap, popular manuals on the whole range of social questions. They should be well-written, on a uniform plan, up to date, brought out by writers thoroughly conversant with their subject, and published under the joint responsibility of an alert and reliable committee. It cannot be too clearly impressed upon the mind that social and political problems are most difficult and complicated, and that the smart and easy solutions of the platform orator or the leaflet are often but the crudest superficialities. And to every one who will take up these burning questions I would say: First get your facts, and as many of them as you are able; then examine them calmly; mark their bearings and abstain from prophesying. Stand by the hard, irresistible facts of life. And it is worth while to observe that, though the world is always progressing in some degree, and it is wise for us to progress with it, still it will be very unwise to ignore the lessons bequeathed to us by the past.

One concluding word. In social work we have preeminently an occupation for the laity, men and women.

This occupation may range from an hour or two a week to constant and salaried employment. The overworked clergy can undertake but little of this burden. Indeed, their proper sphere of action lies mainly in another direction. This field is open to our zealous laity, and the time has arrived for them to enter it in large numbers.

Socialism and Christianity*

I.

The question has been much discussed as to whether a definite and special social doctrine is to be found in the Gospel;(1) whether it puts forward a distinct theory or the outlines of an economic system which would offer a solution of the problems that confront the present age.(2) Did our Lord come into the world as a great social reformer? Did he intend to upset and renew the social and political conditions He found in existence? Did He elaborate a scheme of life for the family, society, the State? Did He lay down in detail definite and unchangeable laws regarding justice, labor, property, riches and poverty?(3) Did He aim at securing equality of possession and material comfort amongst men? With us religion is not a mere individual affair left to our private judgment and our private thoughts. It has been always conceived, preached and propagated as essentially and preeminently social.(4) Does the Gospel, then, not trace the foundation of the "City of God"? Does it convey to us no social message to serve as a lamp in the darkness that envelopes us?

---

*Article by the Rev. J. F. Hogan, D.D., in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* January, 1909.

(1) *Jesus Christ and the Social Question,* by C. Peabody, Professor of Christian Morals, University of Harvard, chap. i, p. 53. *Evangelium und Arbeit,* by Simon Weber. Herder, Freiburg, 1898. *Christliche Lehre vom Erdengut,* by Alfred Winterstein. Kircheim, Mainz, 1898.

(2) *L'Enseignement Social de Jésus,* A. Lugan, xi-xvi.

(3) *Evangelium und Arbeit,* Simon Weber.

(4) *Discours de Combat,* F. Brunetière, "L'Idée de Solidarite."

Christ, our Lord, is not a reformer like those of this world. He came not only to redeem us but to teach us our true relations to the Father who is in heaven.(1) His kingdom was not of this world. It was another kingdom He came to establish. When once that other kingdom was firmly founded in the hearts of men all other interests would be promoted.(2) Seek this first and all the rest will be added unto you. It is not that earthly conditions were indifferent to Him; but He takes His own way of reaching them; for His kingdom begins with the life of faith and grace; and faith and grace will work out their harmonious purpose here as well as hereafter. He does not repel or seek to repress any legitimate aspirations of those around Him; but apparently he accepted both the social and political organization of His time. His enemies wished to entrap Him into a declaration against Roman rule in Judæa when they asked Him was it lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar.(3) It was lawful within the limits of Cæsar's rights, but not beyond them. God had rights which assuredly were not subordinate to Cæsar's; and they, too, should be respected. Had Roman rule been oppressive and the Jews risen in revolt, it is probable that Christ with equal indifference would have enunciated some general law applicable to all nations and all times. He saw around Him the upper classes, proud, selfish, severe; the poor, wretched and despised. Nowhere does He seek to foment disturbance, or urge the poor to rebel. He had only to put Himself at their head when, more than once, they wished to make

---

(1) Matt. vii, 21; xii, 28.
(2) Matt. vi, 33.
(3) Matt. xxii, 17.

Him their king;(1) but the rôle of the agitator or the demagogue could not be His. He did not come to bring war to society, but peace; and if in any sense He brought into the world not peace, but a sword, it was a sword to make war on pride and selfishness, the corruption of the heart, and undue attachment to the things of earth.(2) When Cæsar-Augustus issued his edict for the taking of the census, Joseph and Mary, leaving Nazareth, go up to Bethlehem, to obey the law; and it was there that the Saviour of the world was born, consecrating by His advent at that particular juncture an act of obedience to the orders of a pagan prince. His subsequent life confirms the lesson of His birth. Neither against Cæsar nor his viceroys nor governors does He utter a word of sedition. Three of His most striking miracles are performed in the interest of Centurion officers of the Roman army. The whole organization around Him, consisting of civil servants, fiscal officials, magistrates, officers, soldiers, landowners and laborers, masters and servants, not only escapes comment or condemnation, but is the basis of the parables of the lost sheep, the unjust steward, the prodigal son, the laborers in the vineyard, the nuptial feast, and many others, which would appear to recognize it as part of a just and legitimate order of things. But whilst Jesus did not touch there and then the existing organization, He was sowing in the hearts of men a seed which He knew would grow to mighty proportions, imparting a doctrine which would leaven the mass of mankind and effect a transformation of that society, gradual and slow it might be, but how great the history of Christianity can tell. "Dives" He condemns,

(1) John vi, 15; Matt. xxi, 9; Mark xi, 10.
(2) Matt. x, 34.

not because he was rich, but because he allowed Lazarus to die of hunger at his door.(1) And if He says(2) that "it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God," He immediately adds: "The things that are impossible with men are possible with God."

He showed, on the other hand, His predilection for the poor by becoming one of themselves and living in their midst. He was the "Son of the Carpenter,"(3) the "worker in wood," and although His mother had in her veins the royal blood of David, she, too, was lowly and humble. His best graces and gifts were for the poor. His Apostles belonged almost exclusively to the laboring and humble classes. On all His journeys it is the poor who follow and surround Him. It was to evangelize the poor His Father sent Him, *evangelizare pauperibus misit me.*(4) He consoles the widows, cures the lame, the deaf, the dumb and the blind, feeds the hungry, comforts the distressed. He who offers a cup of water to one of His followers shall not lose his reward.(5) He is the only begotten Son of the Eternal Father, the great elder brother of all men; and when they appear before Him to be judged, their best title to His favor and clemency will be that when He was thirsty they gave Him to drink; when He was hungry they fed Him; when He was naked they clothed Him; when He was in prison they came to Him; when He was a stranger they gave Him shelter; for as often as they did any of these things

(1) Luke vi, 19, 31.
(2) Luke xviii, 25.
(3) Mark vi; Matt. xiii, 55.
(4) Luke iv, 18.
(5) Matt. x, 42; Mark ix, 41.

to one of His poor they did it to Him.(1) When He wishes to fill His house at the banquet-feast it is not the rich He seeks (for they shall want a recompense), but the poor and the feeble, the blind and the lame. These the ideal rich man not only invites, but orders his steward to compel to come.(2) It must never be forgotten that the Redeemer Himself was a laborer, and the foster-son of a laborer, a member of the proletariat, an artisan, a maker of chairs and tables, and of the wooden parts of agricultural implements. If there were not another word in the Gospel about labor, that would suffice. Christ ennobled it, sanctified and set it free. So great an example can be followed by any man. If God (3) made man condescended to work and undergo fatigue, who can complain?

On the other hand, "wo to you rich [*vae vobis divitibus*] for you have your consolation."(4) Your only standing in the Kingdom of Christ is as the friends and benefactors of the poor. If you wish to escape the malediction you must hasten to their assistance. His kingdom is chiefly theirs, and you are admitted only on strict conditions. He who is great amongst them must be their servant. He who is humble shall be exalted. He who is merciful shall receive mercy.

Meanwhile our Father [His and ours] Who is in heaven, makes His sun to rise over the good and the bad, the rich and the poor, His rain to fall on the just

---

(1) Matt. xxv, 35.
(2) Luke xiv, 21.
(3) "Jesus fatigatus dat nobis exemplum sustinendi laborem. Si igitur gravat labor consideremus Christum laborantem." St. Bonaventure, Collat. xiv. See also *Evangelium und Arbeit*, by Simon Weber, pp. 21-36.
(4) Luke vi, 24.

and the unjust, giving us thereby a lesson in forbearance that none should forget. From the Mountain Jesus proclaims to us that we cannot serve two masters, that if riches or material welfare are to engage all our energies we cannot at the same time pursue the kingdom of heaven. We cannot serve God and Mammon. Nor should this be a cause of anxiety or distress:

Therefore, I say to you, be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat, nor for your body what you shall put on. Is not the life more than the meat, and the body more than the raiment?

Behold the birds of the air, for they neither sow, nor do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not you of much more value than they?(1)

Be not solicitous, therefore, saying, what shall we eat; or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed?

For after all these things do the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things.

Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you.(2)

What is the good of a man struggling for the shadow when the substance which remains forever is sacrificed?

Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.

Blessed are ye that hunger now, for you shall be filled.(3)

In all this our Lord implies that the state of poverty, far from being an obstacle to the pursuit of the heavenly kingdom, is rather favorable to it than otherwise. But

(1) Matt. vi, 25, 26.
(2) Matt. vi, 31, 33.
(3) Luke vi, 20, 21.

He does not recommend poverty as such, nor place any obstacle to the legitimate pursuit of wealth. It is poverty of spirit and detachment from the things of earth that He recommends as essential. Provided you seek first the kingdom of God and observe the law of justice and charity, you can accept, with a grateful spirit, all that is added unto you. If, however, you wish to be perfect, to do more than is absolutely needful for salvation through zeal for others, to become more and more like the Divine Model, then sell your goods to feed the poor, take up your Cross and follow the Master through the road of trials and hardships(1) and abasement. Few, indeed, are called to this state of perfect charity; the great mass even of the followers of Christ are at liberty to pursue their earthly vocations and lawful employment, provided they do not seek to serve God and Mammon and put the kingdom of this world before the kingdom of heaven.

Nobody need seek in these words an approval of that sort of fatalism which would paralyze the social activities and energies of the followers of Christ. Our Lord Himself would be the first to repudiate any such interpretation of His words. With what scorn it would be rejected by St. Paul, who so vehemently urged even the poor to work, "so that you want nothing of any man's," and gave them the example "in labor and in toil night and day, lest we should be chargeable to any of you, not as if we had not power, but that we might give ourselves a pattern to you to imitate." Nor could there be any greater mistake than to think that because the "kingdom of God is not of this world" it is a sign of perfection in men in general to be indifferent to all that relates to this life on

(1) Matt. xv, 19, 24.

earth. This life is a preparation for the next. The next will depend on it. And this life is concerned with rulers and subjects, families and citizens, magistrates, soldiers, merchants, manufacturers, employers and laborers, marrying and giving in marriage, buying and selling. There is no form of atheism more pernicious, more injurious to God and more fatal to man, than that which seeks to erect a barrier between Christian life, Christian teaching, and all these things. As if religon were a mere private affair, having no bearing on actual life; or a thing of outward show and lip service, like that of the Pharisees.

No doubt it is through the individual conscience these things are to be reached, and that is why the individual conscience has first to be enlightened and purified.

In every man, no matter how poor, how despised, how disfigured by labor, by disease, by the blows of fortune or the stains of vice, there is concealed some place or other a distinct and more or less resplendent image of the Creator. That is what gives him his dignity. That is what distinguishes him from the nether animals. That is what makes his person worthy of respect. That is what entitles it to be protected, to be honored, to be reverenced. God has enhanced the honor by putting it in the free power of man himself to improve the image. That is why our Lord is apparently indifferent to outward things. It is this image He wishes to perfect. It is the inner man He wishes to gain, the heart He wants to conquer. Once that is done in the family, the municipality, the State, the rest will follow. An act of philanthropy, however good in itself, is worthless to its author if the motive is selfish or impure. "Blessed are the pure of heart, for they shall see God." He who is moved by the mere appetite for glory or praise has not a pure

heart.(1) The heart of its own accord is inclined to evil. It is from it that proceed "murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies,"(2) the things that defile a man. It is the homage of the heart that Jesus wants, not of the hands or the lips. The eye is the lamp of the heart; if the eye is pure the body will be pure. No calculations can deceive Him "who sees in secret" whether the heart is fixed on the immortal reward or the perishable hope. Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doth when thou givest alms, and thy Father who seeth in secret will repay thee. And when you pray do not as the hypocrites who love to stand in the synagogues and at the corners of the streets that they may be seen by men. They seek admiration and they get it. It is their only reward. The merit of the deed in the sight of God is not measured by its greatness, but by the intention. The poor widow who gives all that she has, *holon ton bion autes,* what she needs even for her support, for the worship of God, and puts it almost stealthily in the box, is more meritorious than those who give a much greater sum from their abundance and make it jingle on the plate.

Those for whom He has no mercy are the Pharisees who honor God with their lips whilst their hearts are far away,(3) who boast of their liberality and make a blowing-horn of their alms and their piety—whited sepulchres, all respectability outside, but within creeping corruption.

Wo to you that are rich, for you have your consolation.

---

(1) As the crystal is purest and most resplendent when it reflects the rays of the sun, so the human heart is purest when it reflects the rays of divine love.

(2) Matt. xv, 1, 20.

(3) Matt, xvi, 8.

Wo to you that are filled, for you shall hunger. Wo to you that now laugh, for you shall mourn and weep.

Wo to you when men shall bless you; for according to these things did their fathers to the false prophets.

But I say to you that hear: Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you.

Bless them that curse you, and pray for them that calumniate you.

* * * * * *

And as you would that men should do to you do you also to them in like manner.(1)

Here we find enunciated that beautiful law of Christian charity which transcends and surpasses the most generous instincts of human nature. *There* is the sublime link of brotherhood amongst men, which recognizes no distinction of class or creed, of race or nationality, but includes within its fraternal grasp those who hate us and persecute and calumniate us. What comparison can be made between this sublime bond and the "fraternity" of revolutionaries, full of hatred and tyranny, or the "fraternity" of socialism, with its cynical indifference to the sufferings of those whom it persecutes and oppresses, its blasphemous jibes, its vulgar atheism, its advance guard of anarchists and murderers?

And just as our Lord does not consider poverty a thing to be recommended on its own account, neither does He condemn wealth as a thing bad in itself. The condition of the wealthy, when the heart is not renewed, is less favorable to the pursuit of heaven than that of poverty, for the rich are nearly always immersed in worldly thoughts, in material pursuits, in frivolous pleasures, in fashions and

(1) Luke vi, 24-31.

vanities that wither and pass away. But all the rich are not so, and Christ did not make outcasts of people simply because they were rich. On the contrary, there were several rich people amongst His friends. Lazarus, whom He raised from the dead, was a rich man, and probably a financier. This did not prevent Jesus from loving him and his family. How well that love was returned was shown when He was afterwards entertained at the house of Simon, the friend, and possibly the relative, of Lazarus:

Mary took a pound of ointment of right spikenard, *of great price,* and anointed the feet of Jesus and wiped His feet with her hair; and the house was filled with the odor of the ointment.

Then one of His disciples, Judas Iscariot, he who was about to betray Him, said:

Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?

Now he said this, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and, having the purse, carried the things that were put therein.

Jesus therefore said: Let her alone, that she may keep it against the day of My burial.

For the poor you have always with you; but Me you have not always.(1)

Simon the Pharisee and Simon of Bethany, if they were not one and the same person, were men of means and substance, both friends and hosts of Jesus. Zachaeus of Jericho(2) was also "a rich man and chief of the publicans," which did not prevent Jesus from staying at his house and bringing salvation to him and his fam-

(1) John xii, 3-8; Matt. xxvi, 7-13.
(2) Luke xix, 1, 10.

ily.(1) Joanna, the wife of Chusa,(2) Herod's steward, and Susanna, were also rich people who gave Him of their substance. The Centurion of Capharnaum,(3) whose servant He healed, "was dear to Him," and was a wealthy man; for the Jews bore testimony that "he loveth our nation and hath built us a synagogue." Zebedee, the father of the beloved disciple, St. John, had "hired servants," a ship on the lake of Galilee, and a boat for Jesus when He wanted one.(4) There was a certain Pharisee named Nicodemus,(5) a ruler of the Jews, a man of position and wealth, who "came to Jesus by night" to inquire about the kingdom of heaven. To him Jesus vouchsafed not only instruction but friendship and faith: and when He was crucified and taken down from the Cross Nicodemus came bringing a precious "mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pounds weight," and with these spices the body of the Redeemer was embalmed before it was "bound in the linen cloths," and laid in the grave. Nor were these the only rich people who loved our Lord and were loved by Him in return. On the same occasion of the burial it was Joseph, the "rich man of Arimathea," as he is called by St. Matthew,(6) "a noble counsellor," according to St. Mark,(7) "who was himself looking for the kingdom of God, came and went in boldly to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus," having possessed that priceless treasure, "he wrapped it up in a clean linen cloth and laid it in his own new monument

---

(1) Luke xix, 5.
(2) Luke viii, 2, 3.
(3) Matt. viii, 5, 13.
(4) Mark i, 20.
(5) John ii, 1, 21; vii, 50; xix, 39.
(6) xxvii, 57.
(7) xv, 43.

which he had hewed out in a rock. And he rolled a great stone to the door of the monument and went his way."(1) And as it was with Jesus so was it likewise with His Apostles and early disciples. St. Luke was a medical practitioner and a man of education and culture. Paul and Barnabas themselves belonged to the professional and ruling classes. St. Peter raises from the dead Dorcas of Joppa,(2) a rich and charitable lady, who made clothes and distributed them to the poor. When he was driven out by the Jews of Rome from the Ghetto, where he first sojourned, he was taken in by the wealthy family of Aquilla and Prisca on the Aventine Hill.(3)

Amongst the neophytes, friends, and powerful supporters of St. Paul at Corinth were Crispus, who had been chief of the synagogue there; Caius, who was his host on the occasion of his second visit; Stephanas and his family, towards whom he recommended the deference due to their rank; Erastus, the treasurer of the city; Tertius, Chloe, and Phoebe, all of whom rendered him and the early Church the most signal services. It was the same at Philippi, where Lydia protected him; at Antioch, where Manaben, foster-brother of Herod the Tetrarch, worked with him; at Athens, where he converted Dionysius, the Areopagite; in Cyprus, where he converted Sergius Paulus, the Pro-consul; and at Malta, where he was sheltered by Publius. All these illustrious

---

(1) Matt. xxvii, 57-59.

(2) Acts ix, 36, 39.

(3) "Ces deux fidéles, habitant sur l'Aventin, se trouvaient hors des regions peuplées d'Israelites: leur demeure etait hospitallière, leur cœur généreux, jusqu'à exposer leurs biens et leur vie pour ceux qu'ils aimaient. Ils étaient dignes d'offrir asile à Pierre quand il quitta ses compriotes pour évangeliser la Rome païenne."—Abbé Fouard, *St. Pierre et les Premières Années du Christianisme*, 463.

personages, whose names will live forever in the love and gratitude of the Christian Church, were rich, or at least independent; yet neither Christ nor His Apostles required of them that they should part with all their goods, too thankful only for the zeal and generosity which they displayed as the willing servants of God and of the poor, the benefactors of the Church and its messengers.(1)

But if our Lord recognizes social inequalities there is no doubt that His teaching makes for substantial equality in the body social as in the body politic. We are all children of the same Father. We are all guaranteed our daily bread. When we are commanded to ask for it the answer cannot be doubtful. One day when Jesus and His disciples were passing by a cornfield some of those who were hungry began to shell the ears of the corn in order to get some food. The Pharisees were shocked, and asked was it lawful to do this on the Sabbath day. Our Lord turned to them and said:

Have you not read what David did when he was hungry, and they that were with him? How he entered into the house of God and did eat the loaves of propitiation, which it was not lawful for him to eat, nor for those who were with him, but for the priests only. . . . If you knew what this meaneth, *I will have mercy rather than sacrifice,* you would not have condemned the innocent.(2) The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.(3)

The most sacred laws must therefore give way before the primordial right of man to exist. And when he does

(1) See the two Epistles to the Corinthians and Acts of the Apostles, *passim.*
(2) Matt. xii, 1, 8.
(3) Luke ii, 24, 27.

exist his value is not measured by his rank or possessions or power, but by his readiness to do the will of the Father. This is the standard by which Jesus appraises all men. It is a new standard, startling and epoch-making, and the same for all. There could be no greater equalizer. Whoever does the will of God is His brother, and His sister, and His mother.(1) They are nearest and dearest to Him. He reverses the prevailing notions about all sorts and conditions of people. In His kingdom the first will be last and the last first. If any one is to be higher than the others, or to rule over others, it must be as their servants:

You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that are greater exercise power upon them.

It shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be the greater among you, let him be your minster:

And he that will be the first among you shall be your servant.

Even as the Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister.(2)

The laborer is worthy of his hire and those who rule must see that he gets it.

He pays no heed to the prejudices and dislikes of society or to the practices through which these prejudices were expressed. Many who were then outcasts have the kingdom of heaven opened to them. When Jesus tells those who accused the woman taken in adultery that he amongst them who was without sin might cast the first stone at her, they felt conscience accusing them, and began to sneak away in shame under the scrutinizing glance

(1) Mark iv, 35.
(2) Matt. xx, 25-28.

of Him who saw into their hearts. And when she was left alone with Him—

Relicti sunt duo, misera et misericordia—

He asked her was there no one left to condemn her. And she answered, "No man, Lord." And He said, "Neither will I condemn thee. Go, now, and sin no more."(1) The Samaritans were excluded from intercourse with the Jews; yet our Lord asks a Samaritan woman to give Him to drink, and revealed Himself to her, and in spite of her crimes overwhelms her with His grace.(2) The good Samaritan is praised, because he applied to the wounds of his fellow man the healing balsam that he carried whilst the priest and the Levite, who looked only to the ritual and the letter of the law, went their way unheeding. Zachaeus, the publican, is boycotted by the Jews; and yet Jesus invites Himself to his table and heeds not the protests of the cliques and coteries who said He was keeping company with one who was banned.(3) A Canaanite woman approaches Him on the confines of Phœnicia and adores Him. Her daughter was tormented by the demon, and she wanted Him to cure her. She pursued Him with such importunities that even His disciples wished Him to gratify her in order to get rid of her. The Canaanites were idolators, and the Master says that it is not fit that the bread of children should be cast to the dogs. But the faith of the woman was unbounded. Nothing could overcome it. "Yea, Lord," she said, "even the whelps also eat of the crumbs that fall from the master's table."(4) Such faith could not be resisted. The bar-

(1) John viii, 4-11.
(2) John iv, 7-20.
(3) Luke xix, 5.
(4) Matt. xv, 27.

riers of race and nationality fall before it. She is sent her way rejoicing. The time has come, as He observed at the Samaritan well, when all those who worship in spirit and in truth shall be recognized as the real adorers.

As the family is the first social unit Jesus devotes particular attention to it. He strengthens the marriage bond and restores it to its primitive stringency. He lays stress on the duties of husband and wife, of parents and children, of brothers and sisters; and, not satisfied with precept, He gave to the world an example in the Holy Family of Nazareth of a perfect household, a perfect father, a still more perfect mother, and an all-perfect Son. Of the little children he takes particular care. Woe to him who scandalizes one of these little ones. It were better for him that a millstone were hung round his neck and he were cast into the sea: for they bear the image of the Eternal Father in its crystal purity impressed upon their souls.

As for the State, He simply gives us the example of obedience and respect for law as long as it moves within its own orbit, and does not invade the sanctuary of conscience. "Thou shouldst not have any power against Me unless it were given thee from above,"(1) He said to one of His judges. From above all power comes in the State as in the Church, and a strict account will be required of the manner in which it is exercised. In the spiritual order He recognizes no authority in the civil power. When he was informed that Herod meant to kill Him, He told those who brought Him the news to go and tell the old fox that it was not fit that a prophet should perish elsewhere than in Jerusalem.(2)

(1) John xix, 10-12.
(2) Luke xiii, 31.

For the whole social and political body, as well as for the individuals that compose it, the commandments of Moses are renewed. "Thou shalt not steal." "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods, nor his house, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his."(1) For all, too, the Sermon on the Mountain traces the outlines of the conduct required by the new dispensation. But over and above all the rest there is the new commandment of universal and all-pervading force: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another, that as I have loved you, so also you love one another."(2)

If you observe all these regulations you belong to the kingdom of God and you will have done your duty to the kingdom of heaven; for the rest you can strive for your own on the kingdom of earth and have all that is right and just you should have. But if your main pursuit in life is honor, glory, gold, power, there is a short cut to them all. Prostrate yourself before the Spirit of Evil, and they are promised to you by him. Adopt the ways of fraud, deceit, dishonesty, flattery, godless materialism and scoffing unbelief, and he will help you to get on. Have no scruple about ways and means, and you have the key to the world. If you prefer dignity, honor, conscience, you will have your reverses, your trials, your hours of depression and hardship; but you will also have your consolations: for angels will minister to you as they did to Him who is for you "the way, the truth, and the life."

(1) Exod. xx, 17.
(2) John xiii, 34.

II.

There is one other feature of the social action of Jesus that requires to be mentioned. He raised up woman to a position of dignity which she had never reached since the fall of Eve, and can never reach under any other rule or dispensation whatsoever. One spotless woman(1) He associated directly with Himself in the work of redemption. The halo of her glory is reflected on her sex, and has done more to ennoble and elevate it than all the laws that have ever been written.

Deposuit potentes de sede et exaltavit humiles.

"He hath put down the mighty from their seat and hath exalted the humble. He hath filled the hungry with good things and the rich He hath sent empty away."(2) Well may she foretell that henceforth all generations will call her blessed. No mortal tongue can tell what a beneficent social influence the thought of that humble virgin has exercised throughout the ages. After the name of the Saviour of the world there is no name associated with humanity greater than that of Mary. No other name has won the same devotion, the same love. She was honored in the catacombs, where her effigy is found alongside that of her Divine Son. The great bishops of the early ages could find no language capable of extolling her virtues. When the Empress Helena visited Bethlehem, Nazareth, and the Holy Places, she built sanctuaries in honor of the "Son of God" and of the Virgin Mary. The name of the daughter of David has been glorified in immortal

(1) See *Les Femmes de la Bible,* by Mgr. Darboy. "La Sainte Vièrge."
(2) Luke i, 52, 53.

works of human genius, in oratory, in poetry, in sculpture, in painting. Her altars are to be found in great cities, on the tops of the highest mountains and in the depths of the most lonely valleys from one end of the universe to the other. The Emperors of the East placed her image on their banners. Councils invoked her aid and light. The temple which pagan Rome had dedicated to "all the gods" was dedicated anew to her amidst the applause of the world. The Middle Ages called her "our Lady," and, mingling piety and chivalry together, recognized her as the ideal of womanly grace, beauty, and virtue. In elevating to such dignity the humble Virgin of Nazareth the Almighty has elevated womankind to a position it had never attained before and has never since attained outside of Christendom. In raising Mary he has also lifted up the class to which she belonged, the proletariat of Israel and the proletariat of the world.

Another woman, not spotless but named Mary also, was rescued from worldly occupations and sensual pleasures by the Divine Master and attached to His service by such bonds that she had the strength and privilege of following Him on the way of the Cross, and was the first to see Him after His resurrection. Her name, too, has been carried, as He foretold it would, to the ends of the earth on the wings of the Gospel, and has been a mighty influence of restraint and repentance ever since.

Such are the principal lessons on social life that we derive from the Gospel. They are laid down on broad lines, which it will be the duty of the Church, its moralists and legislators to fill in and interpret. This is but the ferment which is to leaven the mass. It is the essence of Christianity as applied to the social world. If we find in it no specific rules as to the degree or kind of equality

that should exist in given circumstances, as to a living wage, as to right to suffrage, as to proportion in which the superabundance should be shared, it supplies us with general principles with which it is easy to know whether existing conditions are in harmony or not. Our Lord did not condemn slavery in so many words, and St. Paul exhorts the slaves of his day to obey their masters as they would Christ Himself. Yet the spirit of the Gospel is opposed to slavery, even at its best, as unworthy of the dignity of man and the brotherhood of Christ. Slavery has gone down before that spirit which slowly but surely undermined and overturned it. The days are passed when crowds of human beings could be "butchered to make a Roman holiday," or when, as Plautus puts it, "the hide of the dead ox was used to excoriate the hide of the living man."(1) Those who wish to know what was the condition of labor and the fraternity of men when Christ appeared have only to read Plautus, who spoke from experience, or Apuleius,(2) or Polybius.(3) There they will see man at the grindstone, a few shameful rags half-covering his nakedness, his skin livid and mottled with the stripes of the whip, the mark of slavery burned into his brow, his head shaved, his feet shackled, his eyes bleared with smoke and cinders. Outside the factory they are chained, muzzled, driven like beasts of burden by a handful of insolent rich people. You see them pass in crowds in the cortège of the proud women who display their extravagant luxury in the Via Romana. You see them give themselves up to the most shameful and degrading practices to amuse their masters and their mas-

(1) *Asinaria*, i, 1, 20-23.
(2) *Metam.*, ix.
(3) *Historiae*, xxii, 11.

ters' mistresses. You see Pollio throw them into the pond to fatten the fish that his appetite fancied. You see Cleopatra try upon them the effects of mortal poisons. You see monsters in the shape of Roman emperors, thirsting for blood and excitement, force them to butcher one another in the great amphitheatre. When we remember that millions of men were thus treated by their fellow men our indignation and horror are great. But who was it that changed all that? Who was it that leavened mankind with the spirit which was not to rest satisfied until it had rooted out from the nations which it had won the last vestige of slavery? The doom of the degrading system was sealed on the day when Christ proclaimed the brotherhood of men and issued the new commandment of universal love, which was afterwards well and duly sealed with the blood of Calvary.

But if slavery in the technical sense is gone, there is no doubt that there are remnants of it still disguised, and sometimes scracely disguised, remaining. The spirit of the Gospel is just as much opposed to anything there is of harshness, of injustice, of oppression in the conditions of modern life as it was to the existence of slavery. If capitalism tends to crush and degrade the human person, in so far as it does so it is no more of a dogma and deserves just as little consideration as slavery. The leaven of the Gospel will ferment against it also and drive it out as that leaven drove out the thong and the shackles.

The earth and all that it produces has been given to man for his nourishment and subsistence. God is the supreme Lord and Master of all things; but He has granted the possession and use of the earth and the fruits of the earth to men. It is not His will, however, as Leo

XIII points out,(1) that they should be enjoyed in promiscuous confusion. It is in the interests of all that the earth should be divided and left to the industrious cultivation of a certain number. It is in this way the best results are drawn from it. The equality of men in the providential order is the equality of origin, equality of destiny, equality of redemption in the blood of Jesus Christ, not the equality of possession of material things. The possession of material things is left to the natural laws of human industry and social necessities. And there is nothing social order requires so much as respect for private property, whether movable or immovable. Peace, order, prosperity would be impossible without it. It is the natural desire of man to possess, and it is in the interests of society that he should possess, according to his industry and his talents. It is a necessity of his position as the head of a family to provide for his children. It is in the nature of things that community of possession leads either to negligent cultivation or to interminable disputes. Where have we ever seen things owned in common, outside of communities bound by vows, that friction and contention were not the order of the day? Even two brothers can seldom work a farm in peace. Idleness or neglect on one side, recrimination on the other, lawsuits, wrangling, confusion. If, then, the members of the same family will not agree, how can a vast community be expected either to agree or to develop in common the ground on which they live? Nature, therefore, wisely allows, and authorizes if it does not command, the division and distribution of the earth's surface; and the possession which nature authorizes the law of the Gospel

(1) *Rerum Novarum.*

sanctions. This possession is subject to the supreme dominion of the Creator, who, in a general way, gave the earth and its fruits to the human race for its nourishment and support: but apart from that right, which must, of course, have human interpreters, it is intangible and indefeasible. There is nothing either in the Old or the New Testament to question it, or set it aside. Every word that bears on it serves, on the contrary, to confirm and strengthen it. The earth and its fruits are meant for the sustenance of the human race. They belong to all men in the abstract, and *in potentia.* All men are entitled to their sustenance from the eternal bounty. But the best means of securing this is not that all things should be owned in common, as the Socialists demand. There are some more capable than others of making them productive and useful, and to these the use of them is given in the concrete and *in actu.* It is the interests of all that they should hold them with a strict right of possession as long as they carry out the intention of the supreme Lord and Master of all that exists or can exist.

But what is this wonderful argument in favor of communism or Socialism (for there is very little difference between the two), drawn from the teaching or the practice of the early Christians? It has, in the first place, to be borne in mind that the practice of community of goods was confined to the Church of Jerusalem. It is not found elsewhere. Neither at Ephesus, nor at Antioch, nor at Corinth, nor at Rome, is there any trace of it. And at Jerusalem it was perfectly voluntary. There was nothing whatever to oblige any one to divest himself of his worldly goods in order to be baptized and be a member of the Christian community there. There is, as far as I know, nothing whatever to prevent Socialists at the pres-

ent day from putting their goods in common in a similar manner, provided they do not seek to compel others to follow their example. The compulsion of others, however, seems a much more characteristic feature of their program than any self-denying ordinance of their own to this end.

But, at all events, what are their arguments?

I. Soon after Jesus ascended into heaven the Holy Ghost was sent upon His Apostles, who went about speaking to all the strangers and foreigners in tongues they had never learned. The people were stricken with astonishment at the prodigy, as well they might. In one day three thousand souls were added to the little band of Christians. St. Peter, their leader and chief, addressed them in eloquent words, in which he recalled the prophecies of Joel and of David, and reproached them with having crucified their Lord and Christ. He called upon them to do penance and exhorted them to separate themselves from a perverse generation. Under the spell of the eloquence of St. Peter, as well as of the miraculous event they had just witnessed, the neophytes were baptized. I must let the sacred writer describe what followed:(1)

And they were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers.

And fear came upon every soul: many wonders also and signs were done by the Apostles in Jerusalem, and there was great fear in all.

And all they that believed were together, and had all things common.

---

(1) Acts ii, 42-47.

Their possessions and goods they sold, and divided them to all, according as every one had need.

And continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they took their meat with gladness and simplicity of heart;

Praising God and having favor with all the people. And the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved.

Further on we read:(1)

And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul: neither did any one say that aught of the things he possessed was his own, but all things were common unto them.

And with great power did the Apostles give testimony of the resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord; and great grace was in them all.

For neither was there any one needy among them: for as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things they sold,

And laid it down before the feet of the Apostles. And distribution was made to every one, according as he had need.

And Joseph, who by the Apostles was surnamed Barnabas (which is by interpretation, the son of consolation), a Levite, a Cyprian born,

Having land, sold it, and brought the price, and laid it at the feet of the Apostles.

St. James in his Epistle, addressed in all probability to the same people of Jerusalem amongst whom the Christains had all things in common, said:(2)

---

(1) Acts iv, 32-35.
(2) James v, 1-8.

Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl in your miseries which shall come upon you.

Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth eaten.

Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be for a testimony against you, and shall eat your flesh like fire. . . .

Behold the hire of the laborers, who have reaped down your fields, which by fraud has been kept back by you, crieth: and the cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.

You have feasted upon earth, and in riotousness you have nourished your hearts in the day of slaughter.

You have condemned and put to death the just One, and he resisted you not.

Be patient, therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, patiently bearing till he receive the early and the later rain.

Be ye therefore also patient, and strengthen your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand.

II. St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians,(1) says:

And we charge you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly and not according to the tradition which they have received of us.

For yourselves know how you ought to imitate us: for we were not disorderly among you;

Neither did we eat any man's bread for nothing, but in labor and in toil we worked night and day, lest we should be chargeable to any of you.

(1) 2 Thess. iii, 6-15.

Not as if we had not power, but that we might give ourselves a pattern unto you to imitate us.

For also when we were with you this we declared to you; that, if any man will not work neither let him eat.

For we have heard there are some among you who walk disorderly, working not at all, but curiously meddling.

Now we charge them that are such, and beseech them by the Lord Jesus Christ, that, working with silence, they would eat their own bread.

But you, brethren, be not weary in well-doing, and if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man and do not keep company with him that he may be ashamed:

Yet do not esteem him as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother.

In his First Epistle to the same people he had said:(1)

But we entreat you, brethren, that you abound more:

And that you endeavor to be quiet, and that you do your own business, and work with your own hands, as we commanded you: and that you walk honestly towards them that are without; and that you want nothing of any man's.

III. Finally, St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, (2) says:

For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich He became poor, for your sakes; that through His poverty you might be rich.

* * * * * *

For I mean not that others should be eased and you burdened, but by an equality.

---

(1) 1 Thess. iv, 10, 11.
(2) 2 Cor. viii, 9, 13, 14.

In this present time let your abundance supply their want, that their abundance also may supply your want, that there may be an equality.

I. Now it is quite clear even from the passages quoted that there was not the slightest compulsion put upon the Christians of Jerusalem to part with their goods. They did it of their own free will. They first sold their lands or houses or personal possessions, thereby establishing their right to them, and then of their own free will put the price of them in the common stock. Many of them, at all events, did this; but there may have been, and must have been, exceptions. It was not obligatory. That their contribution was a free gift is clear also from the story of Ananias and Saphira. This pair were hankering after the Christian life. They had seen the wonderful things done and were afraid, like the rest. They admired the devotion of the Christians to one another, and wished to have a share in their happiness. They knew that those who contributed all they possessed were maintained at the expense of the body. So they sold what they had, concealed part of the price, and brought the remainder to the feet of the Apostles, pretending that they were bringing the whole. They wished to have a foot in both kingdoms, to serve God and Mammon. They made a profession of perfection whilst they still clung to the world. St. Peter saw through their device, and made an example of them before the assembled brethren. It was the fraud he punished, the lie to the Holy Ghost. For he says to Ananias:

Whilst it remained did it not remain to thee? And after it was sold was it not still in thy power?(1)

---

(1) Acts v, 4.

In other words, there was nothing to compel him to sell his property at all, and when he did sell it there was nothing to compel him to part with the price of it. But when he came pretending that he was giving the whole price whilst in reality he had a good share of it in his pocket he was lying to the Holy Ghost. For this he paid a penalty which was intended as a lesson for all future time, although, as one of the Fathers puts it, he only in all probability forfeited the life of the body, not the life of the soul.

Neither in any of the texts quoted nor anywhere else in Scripture is there anything to suggest that the offering to the common chest was not purely voluntary. There is, on the contrary, everything to suggest that its merit came from its spontaneity and from the desire under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost to conform to the highest counsels of the Master. Even in the terrible text of St. James against the rich it is the fraud by which wealth is so often acquired that calls for his severest denunciations. The fraud of the usurer, the fraud of the heartless employer, the sweating task-master, the dishonest merchant, the corrupt official. With these he associates the riotous liver, the *bon viveur,* the whole tribe of dudes and swells, of dissolute and worthless dawdlers, of sensual and corrupt and material men and women, who have unbridled passions and money to gratify them. At what period of her history did not the Church of Christ and her ministers repeat against such as these the denunciations of St. James?

II. The words of St. Paul in the passage that I have quoted above on which the Socialists chiefly base their arguments are: "If any man will not work neither let him eat." There is, of course, a sense in which that say-

ing is of universal application, and includes the rich as well as the poor; but I have quoted a considerable part of the context in order that the reader might see what St. Paul had here directly in his mind. There was a young Church growing up in Macedonia under the fostering care of Luke, of Timothy, of Silas and of Paul himself. Thessalonica, one of its principal towns, was famous for its maritime traffic and for its manufactures. Woolen, carpets, and all sorts of cloths and stuffs were made here on a large scale. It was a hive of industry. St. Paul and his companions made a rich harvest in the ranks of the proletariat of the place. Amongst some of these there was a tendency to idleness and a disposition to sponge on the charitable generosity of the community. In order to give them an example, St. Paul himself worked night and day at the trade of a weaver at the house of Jason, with whom he lodged. He would not be chargeable to any one, though entitled to his support, to show them that manliness and independence, "wanting nothing of any man's," were marks of the faith. This was effective whilst St. Paul was there; but when he was driven out by the intrigues and plots of the Jews, they relapsed to their original tendency. Many of them were by nature loafers and idlers who went about disturbing the peace of the community, carrying stories, exciting jealousy and envy, and "working not at all." They were also disorderly fellows, whose life was not edifying. They made a pretext for their idleness of what they understood or misunderstood as the teaching of St. Paul about the end of the world. They were probably socialists in their way, and thought the rich were not doing enough and should be compelled to share.

This is the fraternity which St. Paul asks his brethren

to shun. It is of these he says: "If a man will not work neither let him eat." He tells the faithful to give them nothing, but let them earn their bread like honest men. They should avoid them in order to make them ashamed of themselves. Yet they should not treat them as enemies, but admonish them as brothers. I do not quite see what consolation there is in all that for the socialist unless he is willing to come to be admonished. Not that all socialists are poor by any means. There are many rich men amongst them, who subsidize newspapers and associations, and encourage strikes and social turmoil, so as to depreciate stocks and shares on which they have a covetous eye. When these go down they buy, and when the storm passes and the shares go up they sell. They raise and calm the storm as they please, and find Socialist principles most lucrative. The artisans and laborers who are their tools do not see what is going on behind the scenes. They are the dupes of sharpers who are a much greater nuisance than the loafers of Salonika, worse even than Ananias and Saphira; for whilst they make a pretense of wishing to bring all property and capital into a common or collective store, their real object is to augment their own.(1)

III. The Socialists will fare no better in their argu-

---

(1) "Quand la baisse est au *maximum* les financiers qui sont derrière toutes les agitations socialistes achètent à vil prix; puis ils font rentrer les meneurs en leur payant le salaire du crime. Le travail reprend: les actions remontent; les spéculateurs revendent à la hausse ce qu'ils ont acheté pour rien: le tour est joué. Les ouvriers plus meurtris, plus courbés, plus affamés, reprennent le licou dans les usines à demi ruinées: le socialiste ajoute un domestique à son personnel et quelques titles de rente à son réserve." Pierre Bietry in *Le Socialisme des Jaunes*, p. 17.

ments from St. Paul about equality *ut fiat aequalitas*. Nothing could well be farther from St. Paul's mind than the sort of equality they claim. What were the circumstances in which he used the expression? The Christians of Jerusalem were very poor and in great distress. The experiment of community of goods does not seem to have been a great success with them. Whether it was that *quae communiter possidentur communiter dissipantur,* or that the great majority of the collective body had very little indeed to bring into the common store, the fact was that they were almost starving. St. Paul makes an urgent appeal on their behalf to the charity of the Corinthians. He had already made a similar and most successful appeal for them to the Macedonians and Achaeans. He takes good care to tell them that it is to their *charity* he is appealing. From the very start he says, "I speak not as commanding." (1) But as they became rich in grace through the poverty of Christ, so they might become rich through the prayers and merits of His poor. "He who soweth in blessings shall reap blessings." (2) "And he that ministereth seed to the sower will both give you bread to eat and will multiply your seed and increase the growth of the fruits of your justice." In other words, in return for their charity they will receive both temporal and spiritual blessings. And thus there will be an equality between them and the poor.

Let your abundance supply their want, that their abundance may also supply your want, that there may be an equality.

What was the abundance of the Corinthians? Wealth, comfort, worldly possessions, at least more than they

(1) 2 Cor. viii, 8.
(2) Ibid. ix, 6.

needed. What was the abundance of the poor of Jerusalem? Poverty, resignation, grace, prayer, faith, charity, merit. It is between these the exchange is to be made. *Ut fiat aequalitas.* The Socialists are welcome at any time to that equality; but let them not look for any other in the words of St. Paul; and let them not quote St. Paul as "commanding" or requiring even that much, but as appealing for it in charity.

The equality that Christ established is the equality of title to a share in the sacrifice of Calvary on the conditions He laid down, the equality of children of the same family, some getting more and some less, according to their talents, their merits, and their aptitudes, according to the father's will and judgment of what is best for all. None are left to perish. Even the lepers and plague-stricken must not be abandoned. Even the idlers and the spendthrifts and the wayward are to be treated with gentleness and humanity. I doubt if they would fare as well in the Socialist State. It is not long since I read in a speech of Mr. Grayson that if men would not work he would send them to the lethal chamber as readily as a useless horse. I should not be surprised if, when Christianity and Christian ideas are rooted out, as we are assured they must be, in certain States, we shall not hear much more of the lethal chamber. It will be once again the liberty, equality, and fraternity of the guillotine or the knife. Evolution, we are told, is making in that direction. Nietzsche, who has come into vogue so much in recent times with hypocrites who call themselves Christians, carries the evolution principles to their full conclusion in his social philosophy:

The religion of pity [he says] has the immense inconvenience of prolonging a vast number of useless exist-

ences, of lives condemned by the law of selection. It preserves and multiplies misery in the world. It is a standing menace to the moral health of the finest types of humanity. The sight of misery, of suffering, of deformity, of ugliness, is the worst danger in the path of progress to the higher type. Christianity and the religion of pity have contributed most efficaciously to the degradation of the European race, and have retarded the production of superior types, the evolution of humanity towards the superman.(1)

It is in the same sense that Mr. Bernard Shaw, another superman and Socialist to boot, tells us that, "Those who minister to poverty and disease are accomplices in the two worst of all the crimes."(2)

Herbert Spencer also observes(3) that the maintenance of the sick in hospitals, and of tramps and vagrants in asylums, of all those who consume without producing, diminishes the quantity of things suitable for distribution in proportion to the number of the useless. The poverty of the incapable, the penury of the idle, the trampling of the weak by the strong are, he thinks, in reality decrees of an immense benevolence and foresight. I know that in the Socialist utopia men like Bellamy would regard the sick as the invalid brothers and sisters of the strong, and treat them accordingly; but both the civilized world and the sick have, with good reason, more confidence in the religion of compassion and mercy, in the charity of Christianity, than they are ever likely to have

---

(1) *La Philosophie de Nietzsche,* by Henri Lichtenberger, iv, 41.

(2) *Man and Superman.* The Revolutionist's Handbook, p. 240.

(3) *Evolution and Morality,* xii, 179; also *The Man versus the State,* iii.

in the professions of pagan philosophy, whether old or new.

I must reserve what I have to say about the Fathers of the Church for another paper.

J. F. HOGAN, D.D.

The Socialist Movement in England

The vast increase in the world's wealth that has taken place within the last hundred years has not been accompanied by that improvement in the condition of the poor which might have been expected. Although the oft-repeated assertion that "while the rich are growing richer the poor are growing poorer," is not in accordance with facts, yet the increase in the general wealth has made the miserable condition of the very poor more evident to the nation as a whole, and more intolerable, by contrast, to the poor themselves. The real state of large classes of poor people in England is not appreciated by the majority of those who are better off, because the latter are not brought into contact with the realities of life as experienced by the less fortunate sections of the community. But it cannot be denied that the evils of long hours of work for starvation wages, of unsanitary dwellings, of uncertain employment or of no employment at all, the abominations of the sweating system and the fear of the workhouse are ever-present realities to hundreds of thousands, or, rather, to millions, of people in this country.

At the Conference of the Catholic Truth Society held at Stockport in 1899 Cardinal Vaughan, speaking of the condition of the poor in England, said:

"Millions of human creatures are housed worse than the cattle and horses of many a lord and squire. Nearly a million of the London poor need rehousing: the medical authority has reported against 141,000 houses as unsanitary in which the poor are huddled together in

numbers varying from four to twelve and more in a single room. . . . Mr. Charles Booth speaks of semi-starvation as the lot of multitudes, and of an undefined line that separates hundreds of thousands from the state of pauperism. Over 40,000 starveling children attending the London elementary schools are a constant anxiety to the teachers. The sweating system, irregular and low wages, physical weakness and race-degeneracy, act and react upon each other with the precision of a law of nature. . . . Official returns made a few years ago present a sad and painful picture of the material and economic condition of the English poor. In the annual death-rate throughout England *one in fourteen* was that of a pauper in the workhouse. In Liverpool *one death in seven* occurred in the workhouse. In the Manchester township (before its recent enlargement) *one death in every five* was that of a pauper. According to the Royal Commission for housing the poor, *one* person in every *five* in London dies in a public hospital, or a workhouse, and if the wealthy classes are excluded, the number is *one* in every *three*. This sums up the material conditions of the poor in the wealthiest country in the world."

Nor is England the only country in which the state of the very poor is deplorable.

"All agree" (says Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical on "The Condition of Labor"), "and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. The ancient workmen's guilds were destroyed in the last century, and no other organization took their place. Hence by degrees it has come to pass

that workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the callousness of employers, and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious usury, . . . and to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

It is evident that some remedy is urgently needed. It is equally evident, from the above quotations, that when the Church strongly opposes certain suggested remedies its action is not due either to ignorance of the true state of affairs or to an unwillingness to recognize the necessity of a change. But when measures are proposed which are contrary to natural justice, and calculated, for that and other reasons, to do far more harm than good, the Church is bound to condemn them.

The particular remedy for social evils which is most loudly advocated at the present time is known as Socialism. But what is Socialism? or, rather, what is meant by the word Socialism as used in this paper? This must first be made clear.

Among political economists there are, regarding questions of the industrial relations of different classes, and of competition, and of State interference with contracts, two conflicting schools of thought, the first that of the Individualists, the second that of the Collectivists. The Individualists favor the complete freedom of trade and labor. All restrictions on individual liberty, except in so far as they are necessary to protect the liberty of other individuals, are to be avoided. Every one should be allowed to make any contracts with others that he

chooses, the parties being assumed to be on an equal footing. Competition should have full play, and every one be entitled to do the best he can for himself, as long as he avoids force or fraud. Individual responsibility should be encouraged as much as possible, and the interference of the State be reduced to a minimum. The Collectivists go to the other extreme. They hold that the State should regulate all industrial relations, and should be the sole owner of land, and of capital, and of all the means of production. Private property should be abolished; competition should cease; the State should be the only employer of labor, finding work for every one, and providing every one in return for his work with sufficient means for a comfortable existence.

Now, any one who is not an Individualist may, in some sense, be called a Socialist, inasmuch as he does approve of some degree of State interference, greater than the Individualist would approve, though less than that which the Collectivist advocates. Any one who is in favor of factory laws or free education may, in this sense, be styled a Socialist; and this, no doubt, was the meaning of Sir William Harcourt when he said, nearly twenty years ago, "We are all Socialists now." It is in some such sense as this that many well-known Catholics have called themselves Socialists.

In recent years, however, the word Socialism has become more and more identified with thorough-going Collectivism, and the word Socialist with those who are carrying on, either here or abroad, what is known as "the Socialist Movement." These men are agreed on the general principles of the only kind of Socialism which they regard as genuine, and which they put forward as a panacea, warranted to bring about a new state

of society, and to put an end to all the evils of "the capitalist *régime*." It is with this kind of Socialism that the present article is concerned.

The Socialist asserts that the poverty and miseries of modern life arise from the inequalities produced by free competition and the accumulation of private capital; and he proposes to substitute for these the State ownership of capital and land, and the regulation of all industry by the State. It will be as well to give the actual words of some leading Socialists on these points.

The manifesto of the Socialist League issued in 1885, with notes by William Morris and E. Belfort Bax, says that "the workers, although they produce all the wealth of society, have no control over its production and distribution," and that "this must be altered from the foundation, and the land, the capital, the machinery, factories, workshops, stores, means of transit, mines, banking and all means of production and distribution of wealth must be declared and treated as the common property of all."

In one of the most popular of Socialistic works, "Britain for the British," by Robert Blatchford, we read:

"The root idea of Socialism means two things: (1) that the land and all the machines, tools, and buildings used in making needful things, together with all the canals, rivers, roads, railways, ships, and trains used in moving and sharing needful things, and all the shops, markets, scales, weights, and money used in selling or dividing needful things, shall be the property of the whole people; (2) that the land, tools, machines, trains, rivers, shops, scales, money, and all the other things belonging to the people shall be worked, managed, divided, and used by the whole people in such a way as the greater number of the whole people shall deem best."

How possession of all the land and capital and means of production and distribution is to be obtained by the State—whether by confiscation outright or by gradually taxing private owners out of existence, or by making some compensation to those dispossessed—is a point on which Socialists are not agreed. Some favor confiscation, pure and simple, others would prefer to put increasing taxes on private property, rent, profits, and interest, till it would be worth no one's while to hold such things any longer. A few would make some compensation, though how this could be done without continuing the existence of capitalism does not appear.

Apart from the question of how the transfer of capital is to brought about, the general idea of Socialism as at present advocated in England is clear enough.

"Socialism has one meaning, and one meaning only. Socialism means, and can mean, nothing else than that the community or the State is to take all the means of production into its own hands, that private enterprise and private property are to come to an end, and all that private enterprise and private property carry with them. That is Socialism, and nothing else is Socialism."(1)

The ideas which underlie this system have spread rapidly on the Continent in recent years. In Germany at the last general election the Socialists, though they lost nearly half the seats they had previously held, secured more than 3,000,000 votes. In France there is a strong Socialist party, advocating similar measures. During a recent discussion on the appropriation of Church property, M. Paul Constans, a Socialist deputy, said:

"We shall vote for this bill, because we hope that no

(1) Mr. Balfour at Birmingham, November 14th, 1907.

one in this House will henceforth say that Collectivism is a Utopia, a dream of fools. We shall ask you to extend your expropriating principles until they cover not a mere part of the ground of private ownership, but the whole ground, and sweep it away, at last, in the interest of the nation."

In England the same ideas are spreading among workingmen, and even, according to those who are in a position to know, among Catholic workingmen. It is true that the Social Democratic Federation, the Independent Labor Party, and the Fabian Society—the chief Socialist organizations—are not very formidable in point of numbers, but they are very active as propagandists. The Independent Labor Party, the most important of these bodies, has twenty members in Parliament, more than eight hundred members on local governing bodies, and over seven hundred branches; and, according to one of its recent reports, under the auspices of these branches about 65,000 meetings are held every year. Moreover, the Socialists, owing to the apathy of their opponents, have gone far towards obtaining control of the trade unions, and of the whole labor movement. This is shown by the fact that on the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress nine of the sixteen members are advanced Socialists, while of the thirty-one members of the whole Labor Party in the House of Commons twenty-three are Socialists.

The effect of the propaganda of the Socialist societies is seen in such elections as that at Clone Valley. At that election there were three candidates, a Liberal, a Unionist, and a Socialist. The Socialist was at the top of the poll, with 3,648 votes. After the election the new member, Mr. Grayson, said:

"This epoch-making victory has been one for pure revolutionary Socialism. We have not trimmed our sails to get half-hearted voters—and we have proclaimed our Socialism from every platform."

How is it that these Socialistic ideas spread so easily? One of the chief causes, no doubt, is the resentment produced by the abuse of capital on the part of men whose sole aim is the acquisition of money, regardless of the suffering they may cause in the pursuit of it. The modern idea of wealth, and of the extent to which it may be used for purely selfish purposes, is one of the many evil consequences of the Protestant Reformation; it is quite contrary to the Catholic idea which prevailed in England before that event. It seems to be commonly held in England at the present day that a man is justified in making money by any *legal* means; and that, having made it, he may then say, "All this is mine; I am entitled to use the whole of it, however much it may be, just as I please." How far removed this is from Catholic ideas, either of the obtaining or of the using of wealth, need hardly be pointed out. The position of the rich man, as merely the steward of his superfluous wealth, is thus described in one of the popular books of instruction used in England in the fourteenth century:

"All that the rich man hath, passing his honest living after the degree of his dispensation, it is other men's, not his, and he shall give full hard reckoning thereof at the day of doom."(1)

---

(1) Some have gone too far in this direction, and tried to maintain that some form of communism is taught in the Gospel. This is clearly an error. The only communism in the Gospel is that of the Apostles and Disciples, as a body of teachers, travelling about, and obliged to break off, for purposes of their mission, from the social life of their relatives and friends. Community

Hence there were not in England in Catholic times those extremes of misery and those gulfs between one class and another which now exist. Professor Thorold Rogers, in his "Economic Interpretation of History," speaking of the century and a half immediately preceding the Reformation, says:

"On the whole, there were none of those extremes of poverty and wealth which have excited the astonishment of philanthropists and the indignation of workingmen. The age, it is true, had its discontents, . . . but of poverty that perishes unheeded, of willingness to do honest work and a lack of opportunity, there was little or none. The essence of life in England during the days of the Plantagenets and Tudors was that every one knew his neighbor, and that every one was his brother's keeper."

Then came the Reformation, which changed all this, and destroyed that great support of the poor man, the Church, a large part of whose revenues were not only given to the poor, but were recognized as being claimable by them. Of the effect of the destruction of the Church Mr. Hyndman, a Socialist, says:

"Thus the poor who had ever obtained ready relief from the Church, the wayfarers, who could always find food and shelter in the religious houses, the children of the people, who repaired to the convent for guidance and teaching, were deprived at one fell swoop of alms,

---

of goods applied only to those so engaged. It applied then, as it applies now, only to those called to perfection, to an exceptional life and to special work in the Church. There is no condemnation of wealth in the Gospel, as long as it is not misused. The account of the rich young man, as given in St. Matthew, shows this clearly, though it has been quoted to prove the opposite.

shelter and schools. This great and powerful estate, which naturally sided with the people against the monarch and the aristocracy, now became a means of oppression in the hands of the landowners and the middle class. Rackrenting and usury were henceforth sanctified instead of being denounced, and the Protestant Reformation became a direct cause of the increasing misery of the mass of Englishmen."(1)

The modern world shows no sign of going back to the old ideas, and large numbers of people at the present day act like those who, not being willing to conform to the true principles of health, are delighted to find some quack who, with a specific of his own, undertakes to cure all their complaints. Without investigating the nature of Socialism, or considering how it would work out in practice, they adopt the theory offhand, trusting to the vague and wordy assurances of its advocates that it is the only cure for the diseases of society.

Not that all Socialist leaders are knowingly quacks, seeking their own ends, or that all those who advocate Socialism do so from selfish motives. There are many excellent people who are so distressed at the amount of poverty and misery around them which they cannot relieve that they are willing to adopt almost any means that seems likely to end it. They believe that, "man being naturally good," the establishment of Socialism would make all men brothers, and that each would work hard for the benefit of all; that thus the general level would be gradually raised, until ultimately a sort of golden age would result. They forget original sin.

"Qu'est ce que le Progrès-indefini! Qu'est qu'une

---

(1) *Historical Basis of Socialism in England*, p. 32.

société qui n'est aristocratique? Ce n'est pas une société ce me semble. Qù'est que l'homme naturellement bon? Ou l'a-t-en connu? Cet ordre d'idées me scandalise. . . . Toutes ces hérésies ne sont que la consequence de la grand hérésie moderne—la suppression de l'idée du péché originel."(1)

That the idea of the regeneration of man by Socialism is a dream was long since pointed out by Aristotle. Speaking of proposals for a community of property, he says:

"Such legislation may have a specious appearance of benevolence; men readily listen to it, and are easily induced to believe that in some wonderful manner everybody will become everybody's friend, especially when some one is heard denouncing the evils now existing in States, suits about contracts, convictions for perjury, flatteries of rich men, and the like, which are said to arise out of the possession of private property. These evils, however, are due to a very different cause—the wickedness of human nature. . . . Again, we ought to reckon not only the evils which the citizens will be saved, but also the advantages which they will lose."(2)

One section, then, of Socialists consists of well-meaning persons, who, in their schemes for benefiting mankind, leave out of account human nature. Another section is much less respectable. They are many men who would like to become masters, and leaders, and owners of capital, but have not the capacity or perseverance to become so by competition in trades or professions, or in any manner that requires energy and patience. They are none the less envious of all who are above them.

(1) Baudelaire, *Letter to Toussenel.*
(2) *Politics*, ii, 5 (Jowett's translation).

They therefore denounce capital, however obtained, and competition, of whatever kind, and say: "Let us abolish both, and all be equal. Then we shall, at any rate, not have any one above us except an abstraction, the State, of which we shall be a part." Then there is another section, consisting of those who, perhaps, are not envious and not ambitious, but who hate competition and the struggle to get on, or to maintain themselves in the position which they occupy. These naturally look forward to a state of things in which every one, industrious or otherwise, would be certain of a living from the State and would be free from all responsibility, whether for himself or for his wife and his children.

Before considering what would be the effect of adopting the proposals of the Socialists, the relations between their suggested system and religion may be very shortly referred to. It is difficult to see how, if the land and all the means of producing wealth are to be in the hands of the State, the work of the Church could be carried on at all; or how Religious Orders could continue or priests be educated, or any schools but secular ones exist. None of these things could be provided for, unless all the citizens were members of the Church. But would any form of religion, or, at least, any form of Christianity be assisted, or even tolerated under Socialism? The Socialists hold that the State has absolutely nothing to do with religion, that private ownership of property is wrong, that children are primarily children of the State, that the individual is to be entirely subordinated to the community. All these ideas are inconsistent with Christian principles. Mr. Belfort Bax writes thus:

"I do not think it is possible to consider Socialism in any other light than as, if not anti-Christian and anti-

Theistic, at least as very definitely non-Christian and non-Theistic. As above pointed out, it may on occasion be compelled, in self-defense even, to adopt the aggressive attitude in these matters. . . . Looking at the matter broadly, and apart from the question of electoral expediency or vote-catching, I think we may conclude that the oft-repeated saying of Tridon, to the effect that Socialism stands for a new theory of life, expressing itself in economics as Communism, in religion as Atheism, and in politics as International Republicanism, taken in a wide sense, cannot be regarded as destitute of justification."(1)

In any case it cannot be denied that the leading Socialists of the present day are, almost without exception, distinctly anti-religious. That this is so abroad is notorious. In England nearly all the leaders of Socialism are of the same character. Shaw, Hyndman, Quelch, Belfort Bax, Karl Pearson, and Blatchford agree with Karl Marx and Herr Bebel in regarding Christianity as an absurd superstition, if not worse. Statements in their various works to this effect have frequently been quoted, and it would be wearisome to quote them again. It is sufficient to have pointed out that the principles of Socialism are opposed to those of Christianity, that the leaders of the Socialist movement are most of them professed enemies of any form of supernatural religion, and that in any case under the Socialist *régime* the work of the Church would be brought almost entirely to an end.

Passing from the question of religion, it remains to be considered what would be the social and economic

(1) *The Principles of Socialism; Their Extra-Economic Aspects.*

effects of a system of Socialism based on the abolition of private property and of competition. And it may safely be asserted that, human nature being what it is, any such system would prove, first, so destructive of commercial prosperity; second, so injurious to the character of those who lived under it; and third, so incompatible with ordinary freedom that no community could tolerate it for any length of time.

1. Suppose the Socialist system established, private property made illegal, competition abolished, and the State the sole employer of labor. The State would require a gigantic organization in order to secure not only the distribution of the goods of every kind required by the community, but also what would be much more difficult, the actual production of all these things. It must estimate, sometimes far in advance, what will be the probable demand for each of these things. It must control every trade, and arrange for the exchange of products with foreign countries in remote parts of the world. Sets of Government officials, working by strict rules and regulations, are to carry on the whole commercial system of the country, with all the intricate inter-relations of different industries, and the complications of foreign trade. How many Government departments will be required for all this? And how will the relations between them be regulated? Without competition, how will they even be able to decide upon the relative values of goods? or even on a standard for any one kind of goods? These are questions which Socialists do not answer. Again, how are the wages to be fixed? Is it to be in accordance with the value of the work done? If so, how is this to be estimated in the absence of competition? How is a day's work of a brick-

layer to be estimated, relatively to that of a chemist or a surgeon? The difficulty of solving these questions by theoretical calculation of labor time, and so on, and the impossibility of leaving them to be arbitrarily decided by officials, have left many Socialists to conclude that the wages of all must be equal. Thus in the "Fabian Essays" we read:

"The impossibility of estimating the separate value of each man's labor with any really valid result; the friction which would arise, the jealousies which would be provoked, the inevitable discontent, favoritism, and jobbery that would prevail—all these things will drive the Common Council into the right path, equal remuneration of all workers."

But would not this, too, lead to discontent and agitation on the part of the more industrious and more skilful, who would find themselves no better remunerated than the lazy and the inefficient?

Suppose, however, that the Government, in spite of these difficulties, were to succeed in carrying on the whole commercial work of the country without being strangled in its own red tape, what would be the effect on production? Would not the amount of that grow less and less? If all are to be paid alike—and it is difficult to see how this can be avoided without reintroducing capitalism—the main incentive to enterprise and hard work will disappear. Next, the development of all, or nearly all, exceptional skill will probably cease. For who will work persistently for years to become a great surgeon or physician, or engineer, if he will never get any more by doing so than he would have received had he remained only just skilful enough to belong to his particular profession? Even manual labor would deteri-

orate. Receiving the same, whether he works hard and efficiently or only just well enough to keep out of trouble with the State, the average man will work as little as he may. This seems indeed to be the ideal of certain Socialists at present.

"To be a Socialist, labor is an evil to be minimized to the utmost. The man who works at his trade or avocation more than necessity compels him, or who accumulates more than he can enjoy, is not a hero, but a fool, from the Socialist's standpoint."(1)

It is a fact beyond dispute that the chief incentive to labor is the prospect of personal advantage to be gained by it, and the absence of this prospect has always resulted in a slackening of effort.

"It is the common error of Socialists to overlook the natural indolence of mankind; their tendency to be passive, to be the slaves of habit, to persist indefinitely in a course chosen. Let them once attain any state of existence which they consider tolerable, and the danger to be apprehended is that they will thenceforth stagnate: will not exert themselves to improve, and by letting their faculties rust will lose even the energy required to preserve them from deterioration."(2)

It is futile to say that all will work well for the good of the community. What reason is there to expect the nature of man, as shown in history, to change under Socialism? No system of Socialistic education will prevent men from being lazy, or dishonest, as long as they have free will.

Then, again, if all are to be employed by the State how is it to be decided what occupation each one is to

(1) *Belfort Bax: The Religion of Socialism,* p. 94.
(2) Mill, *Political Economy,* iv, vii, 7.

follow? If choice of occupation were free, all would choose the pleasant occupations, and no workers would be left for the others. Therefore, all must take turns in doing various kinds of work, or else each one's occupation must, to a large extent, be decided by officials. Thus all special tastes and aptitudes must be largely disregarded, and those who might do excellent work in one direction will often be employed in work for which they are quite unsuited, and will therefore be less efficient. To take another point. It is admitted that the production of wealth is enormously greater at the present day than it was a hundred years ago. This is not due to the increased number of workmen, for the increase in wealth produced is many times greater than the increase in the number of workers. It is due to improvement in machinery, to inventions and discoveries. What would be the effect of Socialism here? It is admitted by Socialists that under Socialism no material reward can be hoped for by any inventor, however much his invention or discovery may have benefited the world. But inventors, except one in a hundred, do not invent merely for the sake of inventing. They would not undertake long-continued researches and experiments, such as have preceded most inventions, if it were not for the prospect of a great reward. In any case, without some private property they would be unable to do it. Hence, under Socialists there would be a great decrease in invention, and, consequently, in material progress. There is little prospect of the public authorities assisting inventors or pioneers of any sort. Neither is it probable that they will undertake any considerable enterprises themselves. The result in most cases being doubtful, and unaccompanied by any personal gain to themselves, they will prob-

ably not run the risk. They are likely to be even more unenterprising than Government departments have always been hitherto, for they will be without the example and the rivalry of private enterprise, which now compels official bodies not to lag too far behind.

It appears, then, inevitable that under Socialism the removal of all incentives to work on the part of the average man, the discouragement of all exceptional skill, the neglect of special tastes and capacities, the absence of all encouragement of discovery and invention, and the natural inclination of the official bodies to avoid all enterprises uncertain in their result, will not only greatly hamper industrial progress, but will bring about a gradual, but sure, deterioration, both in the work of individuals and in the whole industrial life of the country.

2. Apart from economic results, Socialism would inevitably bring about great changes in the social and moral order—changes which would have more effect on the happiness of the people than material conditions. Would these changes be for the better? Take the family. Marriage as it now exists is regarded by Socialists as a capitalistic institution—which it is. Under Socialism the family, the individual home, would not exist. In a work by William Morris and Belfort Bax(1) we read:

"The present marriage system is based on the general supposition of the economic dependence of woman on the man, and the consequent necessity for his making provision for her which she can legally enforce. This basis would disappear with the advent of social economic freedom, and no binding contract would be necessary between the parties as regards livelihood; while

(1) *Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome*, p. 16.

property in children would cease to exist, and every infant would be born into full citizenship. Thus a new development of the family would take place, an association terminable at the need of either party."

Similarly, Robert Owen declared:

"In the new moral word the irrational names of husband and wife, parent and child, will be heard no more; . . . all connection will be the result of affection. The child, which would undoubtedly be the property of the whole community, etc."

Many similar statements might be quoted from other Socialist writers.

Even if marriage were to continue as it is, the children could not be brought up at home. The sexes are to be equal, and all are to work for the State, the women as well as the men. The mother, therefore, will not be able to devote her time to her young children, nor can she employ any one else to look after them at home, for the State is to be the only employer. The children must, therefore, be taken at the earliest possible age into the care of the State, and this is the Socialist ideal. They will thus become almost strangers to their parents at an age when they are most impressionable, and at this age they will be brought up by State nurses and officials, who will have no interest in them as individuals. Is this likely to improve their character? It is absurd to argue from the fact that now the homes of many children are unsatisfactory. That two, or three, or even four or five hundred thousand children are badly brought up, or neglected, is no justification for taking eight or nine millions of children away from their parents. Moreover, if parental responsibility is to come to an end, and the State is to be responsible for the children, will not

the public authority be likely to go further, to claim a right to make regulations in its own defense, to begin to talk about the "multiplication of the unfit," and to establish a system of intolerable interference with domestic arrangements? So far is this from being unlikely that a Socialist writer, repudiating the charge that Socialism would lead to too great freedom in these matters, recently declared that:

"Under the Collectivist system everything is subordinated to the interests of the State, and the personal choice and liberty which men and women enjoy to-day in regard to the marriage tie would be no longer exercised. The State would step in and interfere with personal selection, on the ground that such a marriage was opposed to the interests of the community."

Where is this interference to stop?

Again, what would be the effect of a Collectivist system of government on the general character of the people?

Under Socialism everything, it appears, is to be directed by officials. No one who is not an official will be responsible for anything. Thus every one will in time come to look to the State for everything. For the great majority of the people, self-reliance and independence will cease to exist, enterprise and thrift will become impossible or useless. A generation or two of life under such conditions would undermine the character of any community.

Thus it appears that in a Socialist State family life would be disorganized, and children would be badly brought up and the character of the citizens generally would degenerate.

3. There is a further consequence of the Socialistic

plan for the organization of society which must not be overlooked.

It has already been pointed out that to enable the State to carry on all the industries of the country and control all the professions, officials of some sort must decide what kinds and qualities of goods are to be produced and what work of all descriptions is to be done. For this purpose these officials must have power to decide, to a great extent, what occupations individual members of the community are to follow, otherwise there would be too many in one and not enough in others. They must also fix some standard of work, otherwise some would do next to none. They must also be able to move workmen from one place to another. And it must be remembered that there could be no such thing as throwing up work and going elsewhere. It is impossible to strike where there is only one available employer and no private property. Even if the powers described were always exercised honestly, and without either favoritism or ill-will, as the case might be, the official classes would have such power and authority over the lives and proceedings of the great majority of the community as no government has ever possessed—except over slaves. And what guarantee is there that the power would be so exercised? Or what reason to think that the Socialistic official will be any different from the average official as he is now or has been in the past? None whatever.

Perhaps it will be said that public opinion and the newspaper press will be available to check the acts of the official class. Not at all. The State is the sole employer of labor, and holds all the means of production. It must therefore be the sole printer and publisher. Before any-

thing is printed some one must decide whether it ought to be printed, whether public funds are to be employed in producing it. State officials will, therefore, have power to decide whether or not any particular book is to be published or any particular statement of opinion is to appear in a newspaper. Some Socialists have attempted to meet this difficulty by suggesting that every one would be entitled to have what he liked printed, provided he deposited the cost of printing it. But this would not be possible if there were no private property. The particular set of officials, therefore, who happened to be in office at a given time would be able to manufacture or stifle public opinion, as they saw fit.

"No book could be published except with the approval of some State authority; for the State, controlling all printing works, can, will, and must determine whether it shall be printed. Likewise, the production of newspapers and all other journalistic works would be a monopoly of the State, for newspaper proprietors could no more be allowed to control newspaper factories than any other capitalist some other factory. Clearly, therefore, only such newspapers would and could be printed which voiced the views of the official bureaucracy. Not only would all the wealth of the country be centered in the hands of the bureaucracy, not only would this bureaucracy have absolute control over every man and woman, but they would also have an absolute monopoly over the manufacture of public opinion. No opinion could be expressed, no news could be published, which they desired to suppress."(1)

Thus in many important points the freedom now en-

(1) *Max Hirsh. An Exposure of Socialism,* p. 15.

joyed by the average man must under Socialism be almost entirely surrendered to an official class.

Even if the members of the governing bodies were all honest and acted fairly, and were none of them faddists or interfering Jacks-in-office, a state of things in which others are to decide what you shall work at, and where you shall work, and how long you shall work, whom you shall marry, how and where your children shall be brought up, what books you shall publish and what newspapers you shall read, seems to be little better than slavery. But if the officials may be far removed from the supposed stamp, or even be of quite an opposite character, and if, in addition, there is to be no adequate means of resisting them, or even of publicly expressing an opinion about them, slavery is too mild a word to apply to such a state of existence.

For these and other reasons which will occur to any one who tries to work out the details of a really Socialistic scheme of society it seems clear that in any system which forbids private property, deprives men of incentives to work, makes the State the sole employer of labor and the sole producer of goods, takes children out of the hands of their parents, relieves men of all responsibility for their families, makes the ordinary citizen dependent for everything on State organizations, and gives officials unparalleled opportunities of favoritism or oppression, will end in failure, and while it exists, instead of improving the condition of the people, will do an amount of evil far in excess of any now existing which it proposes to cure.

ARTHUR J. O'CONNOR.

The Month.

The Morality of English Socialism

The conversion of the working-classes of Great Britain to the Socialist creed has been a long-cherished hope among its believers on the Continent. They rightly conclude that if the leading industrial nation were to range itself under the Socialist banner an enormous impetus would be given to the movement throughout the world. In comparison with some countries, Socialist ideas have not made great progress in England. But latterly there has been quite an outburst of activity. Propaganda work on the platform and in the press, demonstrations and organizing have been going on apace, and with some show of success. A large increase of strength in some of the Socialist bodies has to be admitted. And at the present time an earnest appeal is being made to British labor to identify itself with the cause of Socialism.

It seems, then, an opportune moment to make an examination of the principles and proposals of the Socialist program in order to see how far they agree or disagree with Christian morality, and what attitude Catholic workingmen should adopt towards this new gospel.

Much confusion and not a little mischief are caused by the frequent employment of the word Socialism to express widely different ideas. In this essay it is used in what seems its only legitimate sense, *i.e.,* as the equivalent of Collectivism. Whatever it may have been formerly used to denote, nowadays common usage has stamped it as signifying a peculiar and comprehensive remedy for social evils, which proposes to transform not

only the industrial system, but even the entire moral order on which Christian society has hitherto rested.

In his "Quintessence of Socialism" Schäffle says: "The Alpha and Omega of Socialism is the transformation of private and competing capital into a united and collective capital." John Stuart Mill writes: "What is characteristic of Socialism is the joint ownership by all the members of the community of all the instruments of production, which carries with it the consequence that the division of all the produce must be a public act, performed according to rules laid down by the community." Bradlaugh gives this definition of Socialism: "It denies individual private property and affirms that society organized as the State should own all the wealth, direct all labor and compel an equal distribution of all the produce."

In these definitions we have the essential doctrines of the gospel preached by the powerful Socialist organizations existing in practically all European countries, comprising many millions of workers, and of which Marx and Lassalle were the principal authors. The word Socialism has been appropriated by them to express their special theories, and custom has sanctioned the use of the term in that sense. This was the one and the only meaning of the word recognized by Pope Leo XIII when, in his Encyclical on the "Condition of Labor," he examined and condemned the teachings of Socialism. This, then, ought to be regarded as its true sense; to use it in any other is a misleading abuse of language.

No one can be strictly considered a Socialist who does not hold the central doctrines of collective ownership and control. There are measures advocated by Socialists and by them pronounced Socialistic which are not so,

unless they are regarded as steps towards the Socialist ideal or as forming part of a national scheme of reorganization. We are not Socialists because we are in favor of necessary legislative restrictions of individual liberty in order that we may thereby protect the general and permanent physical and moral interests of the community. Again, State regulation of industry, taxation of incomes, municipal or national ownership and administration of businesses such as railways, the post office, gas, tramways, etc., are not really Socialistic, nor evidences of society drifting, as it is so often said, towards Socialism. No doubt they may be fitted into a Socialist scheme. But, as the facts show, they are quite compatible with the existing social order, and as long as the right of private capital stands unchallenged and intact they cannot be called Socialistic.

Having thus cleared the ground, we may proceed to describe the principal doctrines taught by the three bodies of English Socialists, viz., the Social Democrats, the Independent Labor Party, and the Fabian Society. These three organizations are substantially in agreement as to principles and ideals; their differences chiefly regard the methods by which that ideal can best be realized.

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

The Social Democratic Federation was founded in London in 1881. It boasts about a hundred branches in the chief industrial centres of England and Scotland. There are no means of ascertaining the total membership, but it is very probably not large. It poses as the only genuine representative of Socialism, the other two associations having departed from the pure gospel of

Karl Marx. Its organ is *Justice*. Quelch, Hyndman, Bax, and Karl Pearson are its principal leaders.

The central doctrine of the Social Democrats, as laid down plainly in their catechism, is that the only remedy for the misery and oppression which are the lot of a vast and increasing number of the working-class is to be found in a radical transformation of the industrial system. Collective ownership and collective production must supersede capitalist private ownership of the means of production in order to put an end to social wrongs, and introduce an era of social peace and well-being. In their opinion the struggle against exploitation and on behalf of social equality is exclusively a working-class movement. Any cooperation or alliance with those who are interested in maintaining the principle of private ownership is a blunder and a crime which will assuredly delay their emancipation. They must be organized, then, as an independent army, whose aim is to make themselves the dominant factor in the State. Having constituted themselves the ruling class and got all political power into their hands, they will abolish all distinction of class, seize all private capital and transfer it to the State, which will administer it in the equal interest of the whole community.

We can better understand the irreligious basis of the Social Democratic Utopia by a brief survey of the views of Karl Marx, who is still the inspired prophet of this section.

Marx was one of the school of heathen humanists so vigorously and so justly denounced by Bishop Ketteler in his contest with the rising forces of German Socialism and Materialism. The humanism of that period was nothing else than a particularly gross form of Ma-

terialism. The sum of its teachings was: There is nothing above man, neither God, priest or king; there is nothing in man save the concrete being of flesh and blood; the only sources of information are the senses, and they give no clew to the existence of God, "the idea of whom has been the keystone of a perverted civilization." Not only is there nothing above man, but no human being should be less than man, *i.e.,* none ought to suffer degradation or to be condemned to a life of misery. For all had equal rights to share in the benefits of society. And happiness here and now was the sole end of man's existence and the natural, indefeasible birthright of every individual.

Obviously, the tendency of these doctrines was strongly Socialistic. Only in a Collectivist State was there any possibility of these supposed legitimate aspirations being satisfied. Consequently, a reorganization of society on Collectivist lines was a necessity imperatively demanded by the principles of social justice. Marx's theory of value was intended to supply the scientific basis for the Socialist claim to equality of condition. The present economic order rested on the assumed natural rights of private capital. The conclusion of his analysis of capital and value was that private property in the means of production was unjust, that capitalism was founded in spoliation, and continues as a gigantic system of robbery and oppression. He proved, to his own satisfaction at least, that ordinary manual labor, measured by time, was the sole producer of all wealth; "that all wealth is due to labor and to the laborer all wealth is due," and the wealth of all classes not earned by manual labor was robbery. The complete dependence of the workers on the capitalists for the opportunity to earn

their daily bread forced them to submit to his terms and to accept whatever remuneration he was pleased to grant. And a bare subsistence wage, far less than their due, was all that they received of all the wealth which, on account of their labor, wholly belonged to them. While the remainder, the surplus value, or the product of their unpaid labor, was continuously and unjustly appropriated by the capitalist.

Evidently, according to this argument, there was no sacredness attaching to the laws by which private property was protected. They were merely cunning devices invented by the capitalist with an eye to his own interest, and their only sanction was the political power which the privileged classes had gathered into their hands. By force and fraud had they obtained their wealth, and by right of superior force would the proletariat in due time justly dispossess them. Forcible seizure of goods so unlawfully acquired was not robbery, but a righteous restoration to the lawful owners—the people at large.

But this act of expropriation, which was the first step towards the nation's emancipation, was only possible when through organization the laboring class had become the supreme political force in the State. Having reached that point, they would lay hands on all the productive wealth, collectivize it, and compulsorily organize for production and distribution the entire nation, which would then consist of one class only—a universal association of workers.

And with this transfer of material wealth, it is to be observed, every individual is brought under the absolute control of the State, and becomes the servant, indeed, the slave, of an industrial republic. Any independent activity based on personal rights is straightway at an

end. Body and soul, he is the property of society, which disposes of him at will. He must conform in all respects to the regulations of a materialistic commonwealth which regards him merely as an instrument whose only business is to contribute his due share to the temporal well-being.

Such a pagan conception of the functions of the State and of individual rights was the logical outcome of Marx's materialistic philosophy. He was not content with showing that material conditions have a considerable influence on moral and intellectual development. He insisted that they were the sole cause of it all. He refused to assign to the intellectual and spiritual factors an appreciable influence in shaping or guiding the progress of mankind. So he is credited with having discovered working in a society a principle of evolution analogous to that perceived by Darwin in the organic world. That principle he identified with the economic forces which successively evolved the various forms of civilization, and which were moving irresistibly in the direction of the collectivist ideal.

On this showing, therefore, religious institutions, morality, the constitution of the family, and all social relations were nothing more than the effect of the prevailing conditions of production, distribution, and exchange. These conditions have invariably produced hostile classes, and in their conflict all the changes, the ideas and institutions of society have originated. The ruling ideas at any particular epoch are merely the ideas of the ruling class, which has imposed them on the rest of the community. Moreover, as the economic system in the course of evolution necessarily assumes new forms and new functions, the moral and religious ideas which spring there-

from must change also. There is nothing, then, divine or absolute in religion or morals. Like capital, they are only historical categories. They are provisional rules, adapted to a particular stage of the development of the social organism. It was necessary that they should be evolved out of the actual industrial conditions, and it is equally inevitable that they should lose their authority and disappear when those conditions change. And the promise is made to us that "religion will finally vanish when the practical relations of life become intelligible and reasonable" under the Socialist *régime*.

This materialist conception of history, with its open rejection of everything supernatural, forms an essential part of the economic theory of the Social Democrats, and in a slightly less degree of the two other Socialist organizations in England. The avowed aim of the Social Democrats is to set up a labor State, which will have absolute power to regulate all our activities, physical and moral, and to determine all our social relations without regard to personal choice, the claims of conscience, or the authoritative commands of the Church. It is quite impossible to fit Christian principles into their proposed scheme. They are indeed an obstacle to the realization of their project. Their catechism, their newspaper, their pamphlets and speeches make no concealment of their materialistic bias. Bax, who is a reliable exponent of their views, says: "Socialism is a religion, but not in the Christian sense. Indeed, it utterly despises the other world, with all its stage properties, *i.e.*, the present objects of religion. Socialism affirms the unity of human life, abolishing the antithesis of matter and spirit of this world and the other." On the fundamental question of justice which arises in the expropriation of the

capitalist, Bax accurately expresses the opinions of the three English Socialist parties:

"The social idea of justice is crystallized in the notion of the absolute right of the community to the possession and control of all wealth not intended for direct individual use. Hence the confiscation of such property is the first expression of Socialist justice. Justice being henceforth identified with confiscation, and injustice with the rights of private property, there remains only the question of ways and means."

The Socialist's theory of morality is based on agnosticism, and his aim is to make this life as pleasant as possible. Socialism starts from the thought that the sole aim of mankind is happiness in this life. The State is the centre of the Socialist Faith. His polity is his Morality, and his morality is his Religion.

THE INDEPENDENT LABOR PARTY

The Independent Labor Party, though not assuming the name of Socialism, is yet distinctively Socialist in its tenets. Very probably its leaders feel that their views are likely to find a readier hearing and acceptance if they are not too plainly described as Socialistic. In any case, as Sidney Webb informs us, this society had its rise among the Social Democrats and Socialist League Clubs of the North of England.

It has adopted, however, a more reasonable and practical policy than the Social Democrats; it shows less revolutionary frenzy and fanaticism, and it does not openly betray such a violent antagonism to religion. But there is no difference between them as to the ultimate condition of things to which they hope to direct

society if society ever concludes to adopt their theories. So the amended constitution of the Independent Labor Party in 1894 declared its object to be, "the collective ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange."

The leading spirits in the originating of the movement were Keir-Hardie and Cunningham and, more recently, Snowden, Tillet, Glasier, etc., have been important factors in its successful development. It is composed of men who were dissatisfied with the lack of political enterprise among the trade unions and despaired of any radical measure of reform from middle-class Liberalism. At the same time they saw that the democratic institutions of this country, if skilfully used, gave the forces of labor abundant opportunities for shaping the character and the course of the legislation. The Independent Labor Party was therefore formed for the purpose of voicing the claims of the working-classes, and at the same time using them as a lever for the advancement of their special views on Socialism. Unlike the Social Democrats, they do not insist upon the Marx theory of value as their root principle, nor do they think it wise to follow the example of rigorous German Socialism in preaching a class war and in refusing all alliances for immediate remedial measures with men or parties who differ from them on the subject of private property. They perceive that the perfect realization of the Socialist hope is far off; that it can only be reached by slow and gradual modifications of the existing social order, and, therefore, without abandoning their distinctive opinions as to the right and final solution, they use parties and the State in order to introduce minor measures which will restrict what they call class-robbery, and by

raising the standard of life will make the workers more effective promoters of their ideal.

In their clubs and pamphlets, in their organ, the *Labor Leader,* and in their platform addresses they assiduously disseminate the seed of Socialism. They busy themselves also in organizing demonstrations and agitations, partly to intimidate the governing class and partly to provide an object lesson of the truth of their contention that the capitalist system of industry is obsolete and utterly incapable of directing and developing the enormous productive forces of to-day in a manner beneficial to the public.

The success of this movement has been remarkable. Starting as an organized body in 1894, it has now 250 branches in England and Scotland, with a membership of over 25,000. Socialists have in the past made frequent attempts to capture the trade unions, but, beyond barren resolutions in favor of the nationalization of land and capital, little success has been achieved. The Independent Labor Party's latest development has been to induce a number of trade unions, representing 1,000,000 workers, to combine with itself and the Fabian Society in the Labor Representation Committee, for promoting labor representation in Parliament. The chief credit for the creation of this new organization is due to the Independent Labor Party, which, with the Fabians, exercises a dominant influence in its councils. It is highly probable that in the next Parliament a strong labor party, Socialist in principle or in tendency, will be the authorized mouthpiece of the workers of Great Britain.(1)

The leaders of the party do not concern themselves

(1) This was written in December, 1905.

overmuch with abstract theories of conduct and society. But at times they are forced back upon the first principles on which they ground their system. Then their agreement with the Marxist appears. It is evident that in their opinion the only working theory for practical men is Monism. There may be a God and a future life, or there may not be. This, however, is certain, that all men have an equal right to this world's advantages; pleasure is man's only end, and, therefore, it is imperative that the conditions of society should be such as to insure a certain minimum of comfort for every one. Now, they argue, the capitalist mode of production of its very nature, as its workings demonstrate, entirely excludes a vast multitude from any portion of real happiness and condemns them to lives of hideous destitution, hopeless misery and degradation. The selfish principles of competition and private property have been tried and found wanting. They stand condemned as out of date and ruinous in their effects. The logic of events demands the substitution of all the alternative, altruistic principle of Socialism, which relies on brotherly cooperation, not on a pitiless, internecine competition, which institutes common ownership for the general good in place of private ownership and enjoyment, and which will guarantee to each person an equal share, according to requirements, of the produce of labor, to which all, according to their capacity, contribute by their toil.

The teachings of Christianity have no part in the construction of their ideal republic. The idea of a supreme Legislator, of a revealed moral code, of God-given, inalienable rights, and of divine ordinances prevailing in society are all undreamt of in their philosophy, and are, indeed, wholly incompatible with it. They hold

that the people is as competent to transform the moral order on which society rests as it is to change the administration or to decide under what form of government it will live. The State has plenary power to legislate for itself and to ordain the rules for private and public conduct. The moral law they recognize is not from above; it is of the earth, earthy. "Things," so they say, "make their own morality." "What is good in economics is good also in morals." These are their axioms. Assuming, then, the perfection and the justice of their proposed economic system, they must discover or invent a moral code adapted to it. Obviously, as they admit, the old Christian principles cannot be accommodated to such an unchristian ideal as Socialism aims at. And, in fact, it is to utilitarian and evolutionary ethics that they consistently appeal as the moral basis of their scheme.

That the above description does not misrepresent them will be clear from a few quotations taken from pamphlets issued by the Independent Labor Party press. "If you want information about the Independent Labor Party," advises one of the leaflets, "read the *Clarion* and the *Labor Leader*. These will tell you what Socialism means and will keep you in touch with the great international Socialist movement." Now, the grossly materialistic character of the philosophy of the *Clarion* and the violent and vulgar attacks upon Christianity it combines with its Socialist preaching are notorious. Snowden, the chairman of the party, makes the significant statement that the "Independent Labor Party is the counterpart of continental Socialism"—an admission of its irreligious tenets and tendency. According to the same authority, "the churches are the forces of superstition at war with reason;" "Christ is not a Divine Teacher for

the Socialist, nor is His law to be the rule of conduct in the new religion, which is to be a political religion." Modern science, another pamphlet tells us, bears witness to the truth of Socialism. "It is the only arrangement consistent with Nature's laws," for has not evolution demonstrated that the survival of the fittest is the supreme aim, and does not the struggle for existence sanction those rules of action as highly moral which secure to the individual or society the largest measure of material satisfaction? As this writer implies, Socialism will reproduce the conditions, the ideals, and rules which an infidel science pretends to show prevail in the animal world, and which clearly have no tincture of true morality about them. We are not surprised to learn from still another pamphlet that "Socialism will involve a revolution in religion and morals," and that it is as yet undecided whether Kant and his categorical imperative or the system of Comte is to furnish authoritative moral guidance in the Socialist commonwealth.

THE FABIAN SOCIETY

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists. This is the first statement of their official program. And they are profoundly "convinced of the necessity of vesting the organization of industry and the material of production in a State identified with the whole people by complete democracy." This society is most active and influential in London. Its members are recruited principally from the educated middle-class. Branches are maintained, though not with any marked success, at most of the universities. In point of numbers the Society is not impos-

ing, for the official returns of 1904 gave 739 as the total on the rolls. But they attach no importance to mere numerical growth. What they do insist on is that their members shall be earnest and capable promoters of the cause. In spite of the smallness of their numbers, it is true, as Sidney Webb asserts, that "the Society exerts a considerable influence by the participation of its members in nearly all reform movements, by their work at the universities and in the fields of journalism."

In their policy and principles they approximate closely to the Independent Labor Party. But, whereas the latter hope to achieve their end by direct parliamentary action, the former adopt an educational rôle mainly, *i.e.*, a steady policy of permeating public opinion with Socialist ideas.

Bernard Shaw is their chief literary figure, but their most eminent authority on social questions is Sidney Webb, undoubtedly a man of mark in London's municipal affairs. Instead of maintaining an organ of their own, they take advantage of every opening in the public press, and as at least fifty of them are expert journalists, the effect of their activity in this direction must be considerable. The volume called "Fabian Essays" contains an authentic exposition of their views, and has had an extensive sale. Lectures and pamphlets are freely used, and the extent of their influence in London can be measured by this, that in 1892 the Progressive Party of the London County Council went to the polls and won an overwhelming victory, on a program of a pronounced Socialist character written by Sidney Webb, and at the same time every Fabian who ran as a Progressive was elected. It may be truly said that the spread of collectivist ideas in England during the last twenty years is principally due to the Fabians.

When the party was first formed, in 1883, its members were all in favor of revolutionary methods, and looked for the speedy downfall of the old *régime*. Time and experience have moderated their hopes and taught them to labor and to wait patiently for the attainment of their ideal. It has been borne in upon them that violent organic changes are impracticable, and that society is too large and complex a machine to be suddenly remodeled on a Socialist plan. They profess, moreover, to have learned from Comte, Darwin, and Spencer the vital truth that society is an organism, and that if growth is inevitable, yet it must of necessity be slow and gradual. So now they look forward to the gradual evolution of the new from the old by peaceful, constitutional modifications of the existing order, which will keep pace with the growing enlightenment of the people.

Judged by the nature of the measures they advocate and the reformers with whom they frequently act, they seem hardly distinguishable from advanced Radicals. There is, however, this important difference, that, while Radicals uphold private enterprise, the Fabians labor to extinguish it. And their ultimate aim and, still more, the theories on which they ground their case, put them in a class apart.

They believe, with the Social Democrats, that only a thoroughgoing transformation of society can cure its many grievous evils and establish social justice. But they are eager to dissociate themselves from the Marxian theory of value, as constituting the chief argument in favor of the proposed change. They base the indictment of the capitalist system and their demand for its extinction on the appalling misery and injustice apparently in-

separable from it, which render a decent human life impossible for the toiling millions.

The first business of the State, they repeat, is to secure a comfortable livelihood for all its members. A society which fails in this, the prime reason of its existence, is fit for nothing but to be destroyed. Now, society, as at present organized, with each individual free to follow his own private interest, regardless of others—free, also, to accumulate private property by the exploitation of his fellows—has proved a gigantic and frightful failure. It has benefited the few at the expense of the multitude, and presents us with the revolting spectacle of riches and luxury accumulating at one pole and poverty, misery and squalor at the other.

What is the remedy? Abolish complete individual liberty and private ownership in the means of production; "substitute regulated coordination among the units for blind anarchic competition;" "let society be reorganized by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the common benefit." In their remedy for the evils of the time the Fabians are of one mind with the Social Democrats and the Independent Labor Party.

But how is this huge transfer of property to be accomplished without a grave breach of the law of justice? Forcibly to deprive owners of their goods, without adequate compensation, is to the ordinary mind a flagrant violation of the command, "Thou shalt not steal." The Fabians, no more than the other Socialist bodies, are not disturbed by the fact that the Almighty has fixed His canon against spoliation. Divine prohibitions have

no value for them, and their ideas of Justice are substantially the same as those quoted already from Bax. Yet, out of deference to popular prejudice, they promise to give no compensation, but some measure of relief to those dispossessed. They do not recognize an obligation of justice, because they deny that the capitalist has any true right to his wealth.

As the Fabian essayist says, "private property was unjust from the beginning." This dictum is based upon the assumption, which with them is fundamental, that each individual has an equal right to all the advantages of society. Private property, which involves inequality, is a violation of that original right. Further, private property is an appropriation by the individual of wealth or the instruments of production which are strictly the property of all, and such wealth can only be acquired by the individual wrongly pursuing his own interest instead of the general good of the community. This brings us to their root idea, viz., that society is in the most rigid biological sense an organism, wherein every member best promotes his own happiness, and ought so to promote it, by making the welfare of the whole his principal aim. It is from this deceptive analogy that they deduce utterly false views of man's relations to the State, which, if acted upon, would destroy every vestige of personal liberty and freedom of conscience, and would deliver us up to the governing majority to be used simply as wealth-producing instruments for the good of all.

It cannot then be doubted that Socialism proposes something more than an economic reconstruction; it necessarily involves a complete revolution in our religious and moral ideas. The express declarations to be found in the "Fabian Essays" put this beyond doubt. We are informed that "the social system based on religion and

a common belief in a divine order has broken down." A materialist philosophy, which regards sensible phenomena as the ultimate reality will mould the principles which are apt to dominate the collectivist commonwealth. And "this morality will be the highest yet known!" "It will be in accord with the commonly accepted canons of utilitarian ethics." The oft-quoted principle of evolution is invoked to furnish a natural explanation of Christian morality and to provide the new standard and the new laws of a superior ethics. Religious or personal morality has no place in their scheme. In fact, conduct of a moral character is impossible, we are told, until man enters into relations with his fellows. Right and wrong are identical with social and anti-social. Morality or immorality can be predicated only of those actions which experience has proved to be conducive or injurious to the common good. The Fabian "knows nothing of the natural right of liberty or equality." The supreme and only source of right and power is the State. Men's lives will be governed without regard to God's authority, and "all their relations to other individuals and to society will be determined by an all-powerful State," with utility its ruling principle and aim.

This doctrine of State absolutism is clearly contained in the propositions, "The State is an organism, paramount and prior to the individual of every generation." "Though the social organism is evolved from the union of individual men, the individual is now created by the social organism, of which he forms a part; his activities belong to the activity of the whole. Its persistence, then, is, accordingly, his paramount end." Again, "We must rid ourselves of the vain conceit that we are independent units," with personal ends and obligations apart from

the State. In the democratic republic we are merely creatures or instruments for the production of wealth, just as the ruling power determines. Not only must we throw all our powers and the fruits of our labor into the common stock, for the general benefit, but our ideals, the most sacred, our liberty of action, our rights of conscience, the duties of religion must all be surrendered or subordinated to the commands of a State that knows not God.

In their program the Fabians say they have no distinctive opinions on the marriage question or religion. The foregoing quotations from the "Fabian Essays" reveal very distinct opinions on morality, and in the "Essays" the views expressed on marriage are precise and unchristian enough in all conscience, though, no doubt, these opinions are not confined to Socialists. For instance, we read that the Christian idea of marriage is only the outcome of the institution of private property, and that free love or temporary unions will replace the sacred indissoluble bond of Christian marriage. The father will be relieved at once of his rights and responsibilities in regard to his children. These are born into full citizenship and become the property of society, which rears and educates them and, later on, fixes their life's duty in the commonwealth. And the wife, released from her economic dependence upon man, will be free to live her own life, unhampered by any obligation to husband or children.

The teachings of Socialism on such topics are repugnant to the Christian conscience. They would desecrate and defile the home and family life and pollute the very springs of individual or national righteousness. Under their sway, as Schäffle rightly says, "a man would be-

come a mere refined animal, society a refined herd or a superior race of dogs and apes."

It has been necessary to enter into the details of the Fabian doctrines for several reasons. The society stands for moderate and reasonable Socialism. It has been spoken of by Professor Ely as an ethical Socialism, and individual Catholics have at times been led to believe that it contained the sound principles of social reform. Then, though the least numerous of Socialist bodies, it is by far the most influential in this country. In friendly circles its writings are supposed to have proved the feasibility and righteousness of the collectivist system. Without exaggeration, the Fabian Society may be called the brains of the Independent Labor Party. That party embodies its principles and ideas, employs its critical and constructive arguments, and is applying its methods in politics with palpable and ever-increasing success. In combating and exposing the irreligious spirit of the Fabian gospel we are also striking at the Independent Labor Party, which, owing to its alliance with the Fabians and the trade unions on the Labor Representative Committee, seems destined to exercise a marked influence on the economic and religious notions of the working classes of England and Scotland.

The Socialist knows no higher law or aim than expediency. He takes it for granted that society's action will be guided always by that one consideration. It is the criterion which proves the value of all things. Consequently, laws, institutions, the rights of individuals and minorities, the Church itself, may at any time be legitimately abolished or radically changed, whenever the majority judge that they serve no useful purpose or think that their removal will not result in injury to the State.

Once, then, the sovereignty of expediency is admitted and we sever the spiritual tie which unites us to a higher law and its divine Author, our freedom of action and that most fundamental liberty—the liberty to obey the commands of conscience—are placed in jeopardy, and may at any moment be extinguished by a hostile majority in the so-called interest of the public. Yet to this very pass we must come in the Socialist republic. The very idea of an inviolable power residing in the person prior to and independent of the State is a contradiction of its root principle. The whole doctrine of natural rights is, to their minds, nothing but a survival of the superstition of Christianity. It supposes—an incredible thing—that there is a law higher than expediency, a nobler aim than a pleasant life, and fount of privilege and power other than the State.

But the cardinal error of collectivism and the parent of many other mischievous notions is its false conception of the relation of individuals to society. "Socialism of its very nature absorbs the individual into the State in such a way as to sacrifice his rights to authority." This is an essential feature of all forms of real Socialism, and puts an end to morality, because it destroys all personal freedom and responsibility. In its early days the Christian religion vindicated the inherent rights of conscience against the unholy tyranny of pagan Rome, which claimed authority to dictate the belief and control the religious practices of its subjects. Socialism would sacrifice the rights that the Church has won, and must continue to defend, and proposes to erect a State with unlimited power in the civil and ecclesiastical spheres.

In our description of Fabianism we have seen that fact strongly insisted upon. In their view the State does not

exist to furnish opportunities for personal development or to defend our rights. No, the individual exists for the sake of society, and his principal function is the promotion of the temporal well-being in any way the governing section may determine. To this conception of man's nature they attempt to give a scientific authority. They borrow from biology the idea of an organism, and then, passing over essential differences, apply it in an unqualified sense to the State. Then, we are not surprised to read that "the relations of individuals to the social organism are on a par with the relations of cells to an animal organism or of the members of an animal body to the whole." This monstrous doctrine to which Socialism would give effect implies that man is not a person, a free moral agent, with God-given rights and duties independent of the State. Rights cease to have any meaning. As Gronlund says, "there are none save what the State gives," and he adds, truly enough, that "this conception of the State as an organism consigns the rights of man to obscurity," as it certainly reduces him to a condition of physical and moral slavery. For the ruling majority is absolute, and "it may decree whatever it thinks expedient."

Could it be established, Socialism would prove a more frightful despotism than any of the pagan governments of old. Not a remnant of freedom would be left. The nature of our work, its place, its time and reward, would be fixed for us. The State would dispose at pleasure of our persons, our faculties and our property. It would lay its impious hands on the family and destroy its unity and stability. The masses of mankind would be placed completely at the mercy of a small and highly centralized body of organizers and administrators, whose judgments

would have the force of infallible pronouncements, and who would be armed with irresistible power to enforce their ideals and compel the observation of their laws.

We are told by Socialist writers that religion will be a private affair and no concern of the State. But they always take it for granted that once Socialism is enthroned in power religious belief will soon evaporate. And it is evidently impossible that the Church and a State which both claimed to be supreme and conflicting directors of the mind and conscience on the most momentous matters should long co-exist. An omnipotent collectivism would not long brook a spiritual authority which spoke in God's name, which always and necessarily disputed its jurisdiction and the truth and justice of its fundamental principles, and which was, therefore, a constant menace to its stability. In order to save itself the State would have to try to suppress and destroy the Church.

"Every social fabric must be grounded on a system of fundamental opinions" capable of exposition and rational defense. We have seen that collectivism has an intellectual basis, but one which assumes throughout the falsity of the Christian standpoint, and is fatal to true morality.

We can conclude, then, with certainty that the collectivist remedy for social evils cannot be sound or socially useful, since its implications and consequences are so directly opposed to religious truths. No society can rest and prosper on a lie. As the Duke of Argyll pertinently says: "In mathematical reasoning the 'reduction to absurdity' is one of the most familiar methods of disproof. In political reasoning the 'reduction to iniquity' ought to be of equal value."

In the face of the proposed revival of a pagan society it becomes more and more necessary to emphasize the doctrine of man's spiritual dignity and moral freedom, and the unassailable basis whereon they rest. The existence of a personal God, whose essence is absolutely moral, is the fundamental truth which can alone safeguard our rights from unjust attack. The obligations to obey the laws which He has imposed upon our conscience carries with it the power and the right to obey. Our rights, then, are not given and cannot be taken away by the State. They have their origin and authority in the supreme Author of our being. Their validity is bound up with the sovereign rights of God, and are therefore absolute and inalienable. It is in this Divine right that we find the broad and strong foundation of our freedom and all the rights of man.

English Socialism commits its disciples to principles which cannot be reconciled with the Christian faith. Inseparably bound up with it is a false materialistic philosophy. In the name of science—a word more abused than liberty—its adherents boldly claim the right to revise and revalue all the old standards of morality. Experience shows that it thrives and propagates best in the corrupt soil of materialism. Its natural allies are the Secularists. Its irreconcilable foe and the most formidable obstacle to its progress is the Catholic Church. It is, in fact, not merely a party of social reform, but a wing of the infidel army, operating among the working classes, doing its utmost to sow mistrust and hatred of religion, and to excite the hope and belief that the amelioration of the conditions of labor depends on the success of materialism. Herein lies its chief danger. Its future success in Great Britain as an organization of

men pledged to believe in and to work for the triumph of the distinctive Socialist creed may not be important. But there is good reason to fear that it may do much mischief in spreading an irreligious spirit and weakening the foundation of belief among men whom it may not succeed in converting to its economic heresies.

J. J. Welch.

Some Ways and Means of Social Study

It is for Catholics to take the initiative in all true social progress, to show themselves the steadfast defenders and enlightened counsellors of the weak and disinherited, to be the champions of the eternal principles of justice and of Christian civilization.—Leo XIII, *Letter to Cardinal Langénieux,* 1896.

The path of improvement is better assured and more quickly traversed the more we have the cooperation of leading men, with their wide opportunities of effectual aid. We would have them consider for themselves that they are not free to choose whether they will take up the cause of the poor or not; it is a matter of simple duty. . . . What the weight of our obligation is we may discover from the proportionate superabundance of the good things we have received. . . . He who neglects to take up the cause of the poor acts without regard to his personal interest as well as that of his country.—Leo XIII, *Graves de Communi,* 1901.

The accumulation of wealth in the land, the piling up of wealth like mountains in the possessions of classes or of individuals cannot go on if these moral conditions of our people are not healed. No commonwealth can rest on such foundations.—Cardinal Manning, *The Rights and Dignity of Labor,* 1887.

"He knows no more about Socialism than a pig knows about his grandfather." This graphic, if ungraceful, comment, overheard from the lips of a workingman, aptly hits off the apathy of man towards the progress of events around them. . . . Certain signs of the

present times are writ large, and the admission of ignorance about social questions suggests greater pigheadedness than the innocence of a porker about his ancestral tree.—Abbot Snow, *A Glimpse at Socialism,* 1895.

There are, perhaps, few things more baffling to the ardent student of social reform than the bland ignorance of even the elements of social science that obtains among the well-to-do and presumably educated classes in England. As a body, the rich know much less about the lives and needs of the poor than the poor do about the lives and habits of the rich. The great majority of the children of the ruling classes are brought up in complete isolation from and ignorance of the conditions of existence among those toiling crowds whose labor is largely the source of the comforts and privileges they enjoy. From their earliest years their distinctive position and general superiority as rich men's children have been impressed upon them, with but little, if any, insistence on the corresponding duties implied in the rights they possess. The result is, of course, a vast ignorance of the environment and requirements of those that they may be called upon to govern, an extraordinary state of mingled apathy and prejudice as regards their poorer neighbors, and an appalling separation and antagonism of classes that is a constant menace to the stability of society.

And among the wealthier classes perhaps few are more unconscious of the first elements of social science or of the actual conditions and the everyday economic facts of a modern nation than the majority of well-to-do Catholics in England. Any one who may have devoted attention to economic and social study, and at the same time is at all acquainted with the views on

social questions current among educated Catholics, will often be amazed at the lack of elementary social knowledge(1) that exists, and at the antiquated nature and general ineffectiveness of the social policy they approve. Unfamiliar with Catholic social principles as taught by Popes and saints and theologians, or with the results so far arrived at in social theory and experiment, the wealthier and more advantageously situated Catholics are, for the most part, complacently assured that there is no need for them to study social questions or to make any social effort other than the indiscrimnate bestowal of alms and of patronage. "Nihil eorum Gallioni curae erat."

The result of this incivism is visible in many ways hardly flattering to our coreligionists. Convinced that the majority of Catholics neither know nor want to know anything about projects of reform, the greater number of social investigators have tacitly agreed to ignore Catholics and Catholic work; and it is hard in any reference book to these matters to find mention of Catholic societies, or on any list of those engaged in various social activities to find Catholic names. It is humiliating to run down list after list of councils of various excellent and quite unsectarian reform societies and to find nothing or next to nothing but non-Catholic names. Excellent and abundant as are the many *charitable* societies within the Catholic Church, it remains true that in civic and national life, and in activities that

(1) A quaint instance of unacquaintance with familiar social terminology is to be observed in the antagonism to the (now defunct) Catholic Social Union, because its name was supposed in some occult manner to connect it with "that dreadful socialism!" Cf. "Catholic Working-girls' Clubs," by A. Streeter, in *The Crucible*, September, 1906, p. 105.

are rather reformatory than charitable, Catholics have not yet taken the position due both to their numbers and to their social importance.

Of course, this state of things is not without excuse. Cut off for three centuries from active participation in civic life, the Catholic community in this country lost the habit of citizenship, and now, after three-quarters of a century of emancipation, is but slowly shedding its acquired timidity and apathy. Ancient suspicions, antipathies and prepossessions die hard, and during the last century political and social conditions have moved too swiftly for our unpractised fellow Catholics to keep pace. There are many of us that remain pathetically unaware that the actual limited monarchy of 1829 has evolved into the practical limited democracy of 1907, or that political and social formulæ that were advanced and dynamic in the Emancipation period have become the emptiest of reactionary shibboleths in the present day. We are as completely unable to realize the fundamental change that has taken place in political, social and economic equations as were the French noblesse on the eve of the Revolution.

Yet there are not lacking more hopeful features in the situation. Here and there are to be found Catholics, like the late Mr. Charles Devas,(1) who really understand the actual conditions of modern life, who are anxious to arrive at a correct solution of modern problems. Realizing that in any State it is the ruling classes who are finally responsible for all the evils that arise

(1) A good instance of Mr. Devas's perspicacity, and some measure of the loss his sudden death inflicts on Catholic thought, is his last essay in *The Dublin Review*, October, 1906, entitled, "Is Socialism Right, After All?" It ought to be printed in separate form.

out of misgovernment or lack of government, and that in a limited democracy the ruling classes are those possessed of land and capital and higher education and leisure, there is a growing number of educated Catholics who desire by serious study and by strenuous personal effort to avert from themselves at least the doom of the prophet Amos.(1) Moreover, on the part of the great body of practising Catholics of all shades of opinion, their civic inefficiency arises rather out of defect of comprehension and training than out of defect of good will. The *latent* power for civic usefulness that up to now has found an outlet almost solely in works of Catholic charity, has in that field been long the admiration and the envy of the non-Catholic world. In order that this civic capacity may, without the slightest diminution of its present charitable activities, operate also over wider fields of social service it is only necessary that it should be awakened by knowledge of social facts and directed by training in social science.

If, then, we may assume, as I think we may, that there is in England a body of rudimental Catholic citizenship which needs but intelligent direction to come into beneficent operation, it will be worth while to make some slight inquiry as to what are the available means of acquiring the requisite knowledge and training. For these things *are* requisite. There is, I know well, an inherited and fostered(2) belief among Englishmen that every one has a natural and inalienable right to possess and express opinions on all questions of theology

(1) Amos, viii, 4-12.

(2) The rapid growth of this self-complacency since the advent of the more demagogic of our Americanized newspapers is patent to every thoughtful observer.

and politics. As a matter of fact, on either of these most intricate subjects it is but a very small minority of our fellow countrymen that has acquired sufficient elementary knowledge to justify the possession, much less the expression, of any opinion at all. And it is the continuance of government by privileged and entirely incompetent amateurs that repeatedly lands our country into difficulties, out of which we always expect "to muddle through somehow." It is time that Catholics, at least, who by their very profession of faith are the natural partizans of order, or organization, and of training, should refuse any longer to acquiesce in such anarchy.

It will be found that the means of social study, like those of the study of any science, may be grouped under three main heads:

A. Oral instruction;
B. Books;
C. Observation and experiment.

Each of these headings may be further divided and exemplified.

A. Oral Instruction.—It is to be hoped that some day it may be possible to give in all—even of our elementary poor schools—some instruction in the rudiments of citizenship. But meantime it is certainly desirable that such instruction should be part of the regular curriculum of our secondary day and boarding schools and among the younger members of our seminaries. Already, I believe, some elementary instruction in economics is given in the upper classes of the Jesuit schools. But this is not enough. Besides economics, the elements of politics and of constitutional history should be learnt; and, above all, salient examples both of the results of social misgovernment and of the attempts at social im-

provement might constantly be presented to the imagination of elder students by means of illustrated lectures, essay competitions, debates and the like. Of course, nothing of much consequence can be learned at this stage, but any early familiarity with these subjects is useful, both to render them less distasteful in later life and to prevent the building of that wall of class prejudice that now shuts in so many from any possibility of real sympathy with their less fortunate neighbors.

For those who have just left school life and are now at any of the older universities, it is wise to add the Political Economy course as an "extra subject" to their studies. Not that the classical economics still in favor at Oxford and Cambridge has much relation to real life or much bearing on modern problems. But it must be studied before it can be laid aside, if only to gather what there is of value in it; and in any case it is useful as a training in the dispassionate judgment on contentious subjects that is requisite to any profitable social study.

But, of course, most of those who desire to gain more accurate knowledge of present-day problems have long left school and university; many must be busied in quite other engagements; some may even now be working earnestly for the healing of some social wound. For these, if they will but make use of them, there is no lack of places of instruction. In most of the great provincial towns there are teachers of economics attached to the local university, or lectures on economics given by the university extensionists, or at least some local Social Union, or Social Betterment Society, or branch of the Charity Organization Society, or of the Cooperative Societies, or a Citizens' Association, which can be discovered and interrogated by means of a little patience.

In London those who desire a thorough training in the method and theory of social science cannot do better than to follow a year or two's course at the London School of Economics and Political Science.(1) This busy institution, with its thirty-seven lecturers and about 1,500 students, is the Faculty of Economics of the University of London. In its crowded lecture-rooms may be heard lectures on almost any subject connected with social science, from elementary economics to palæography, from commercial geography to constitutional law, from employers' liability to statistical method. Its lectures and its rapidly increasing library, which already contains some 50,000 volumes, are open to any who will pay the very moderate fees. There are few persons engaged in political or governmental work who would not become better equipped by following some of its courses of lectures. Those who require information on specific social reforms and experiments, rather than training in social method, will be able to find it at the "Tribune" Rendezvous,(2) at the Fabian Society's offices,(3) at the Sociological Society's offices,(4) or, best of all, at the offices of the British Institute of Social Service.(5)

The most timid of Catholics, who might be alarmed at the subversive flavor of the first three names, may apply without misgiving to this last institution. It is entirely non-political and unsectarian; it numbers among its vice-presidents the Archbishop of Westminster, and on its council Mgr. Charles Poyer and Lady Edmund Talbot; it is simply "a clearing-house of civilization,"

(1) Clare Market, Kingsway, W. C.
(2) Bouverie street, Fleet street, E. C.
(3) 3 Clement's Inn, Strand, W. C.
(4) 24 Buckingham street, Strand, W. C.
(5) 11 Southampton Row, Holborn, W. C.

whose object is "to collect, register and disseminate information relating to all forms of social service." Already during the two years of its existence it has rendered the most valuable assistance to investigators of all shades of opinion; its growing library and its courteous staff are ever at the service of any serious inquirer; its valuable organ, *Progress,*(1) already in its second year of publication, is a storehouse of information on all sorts of social activity. With the London School of Economics and the British Institute of Social Service within easy reach, the social student in London can obtain all the oral instruction he can possibly need.

B. Books.—There is an immense and ever-growing literature of sociology, much of it of a partizan and almost valueless nature, but the residue so vast in quantity and so varied in subject as to be a cause of bewilderment to the beginner. Yet the books that any individual student need *possess,* even if he have not easy access to a properly equipped library, are neither very many nor very expensive. Even of the examples I shall name only a few need be actually in the student's possession,(2) though, of course, it is desirable to avail oneself whenever possible of any lending or reference library for the purpose of as thorough study as may be prac-

---

(1) Published quarterly, at the Institute office, price 4s. per annum. Each number contains a classified bibliography for the preceding three months. No *serious* student of social questions can now afford to be without this excellent periodical.

(2) I mark those it seems to me desirable to possess with an asterisk (*), and, where possible, I give for convenience, in brackets, the publisher's name and the published price. Of course, however, the books I name are, for the most part, only such as would be useful for *beginners* in these studies. Advanced students are quite able to consult for themselves the proper bibliographies.

ticable.(1) Now, the books that are likely to be of service in social study may be roughly and conveniently divided under four headings:

1. Reference books;
2. Textbooks and manuals;
3. Descriptive books;
4. Related literature.

A few examples will illustrate the meaning of these headings:

1. *Reference Books.*—Under this term will be included bibliographies, such as that invaluable list of books on social subjects which the Fabian Society publish, called "What to Read"* (3 Clement's Inn, W. C., 1901, 6d. net), with its supplement, "More Books to Read"* (1906, *id.*); also directories of all sorts, like the "Handbook of Catholic Charitable and Social Works"* (Catholic Truth Society,(2) 1906, 6d. net); "The Municipal Year-Book" (E. Lloyd, 3s. 6d. net); "The Reformer's Year-Book"* (4 Clement's Inn, W. C., 1s. net); "The Charities Annual Register and Digest"* (Charity Organization Society, Dennison House, Vauxhall Bridge Rd., S. W., 5s. net); also all Blue Books, reports of municipal committees, collections of statistics, and the like.

2. *Textbooks and Manuals.*—These are mainly of three kinds, primers of political science, manuals of economics and statements of specific social theories and the opposition to them. Of the first kind by far the

(1) All who are interested in these matters should make every effort to see that their local public library is supplied with a proper selection of really useful works on social subjects.

(2) 69 Southwark Bridge road, London, S. E.

most important primer of Politics for Catholics is the collection of Leo XIII's great Encyclicals on social principles. These are conveniently collected and translated in "The Pope and the People"*(1) (Catholic Truth Society, 1902, 2s.). Other useful books are Aristotle's "Politics," translated by B. Jowett (Clarendon Press, 1906, 3s. 6d.); T. Raleigh, "Elementary Politics" (Clarendon Press, 1897, 1s.); T. H. Green, "The Principles of Political Obligation" (Longmans, 1902, 5s.) and J. K. Bluntschli, "The Theory of the State" (Clarendon Press, 1898, 8s. 6d.).

In the second class quite the best manual of economics for Catholics is C. S. Devas's "Political Economy"*(2) (Longmans, 2nd ed., 1901, 7s. 6d.); other manuals worth studying are R. T. Ely's "Outlines of Economics" (Hunt, New York, 1894, 5s.); A. Marshall, "Economics of Industry (Macmillan, 1892, 3s. 6d.); J. Ruskin, "Unto this Last"* (Dent, 1907, 1s.).

The third class is very wide. Among the best recent works are C. S. Devas's "Key to the World's Progress" (Longmans, 1906, 5s. net); the two series of "Sociological Papers" (Sociological Society, 1905, 1906, 10s. 6d. net, each); W. D. P. Bliss, "Handbook to Socialism" (Sonnenshein, 1895, 3s. 6d.); Victor Cathrein, S.J., "Socialism"* (Benziger, New York, 1904, $1); J. A. Ryan, "A Living Wage"* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1905, $1 net); J. E. Hand, "Science in Public Affairs"

---

(1) In connection with these should be studied the two valuable articles by C. S. Devas, "The Political Economy of Leo XIII," in *The Dublin Review* for April and July, 1902. It would be of great service to Catholic students if these two articles could be reprinted in a cheap and handy form.

(2) Messrs. Longmans inform me that a third revised edition is now (February, 1907) in the press.

(Allen, 1906, 5s. net); "Towards a Social Policy" (Rivers, 1905, 1s. net).

3. *Descriptive Books.*—First under this heading come the general histories of economics and industrial development, such as W. Cunningham and E. A. MacArthur, "Outlines of English Industrial History"* (Cambridge University Press, 1894, 4s.); J. E. Thorold Rogers, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages" (Sonnenshein, 1890, 10s. 6d.); J. A. Hobson, "The Evolution of Modern Capitalism" (Scott, 1894, 3s. 6d.); H. de B. Gibbins, "History of Commerce in Europe" (Macmillan, 1891, 3s. 6d.).

Next come the histories of specific economic and social movements, such as B. L. Hutchins and A. Harrison, "A History of Factory Legislation" (King, 1903, 10s. 6d. net); Sidney and Beatrice Webb, "English Local Government (Longmans, 1906, 16s. net), and the same authors' "History of Trade Unionism" (Longmans, 1894, 18s.); F. S. Nitti, "Catholic Socialism"* (Sonnenshein, 1895, 10s. 6d.); G. J. Holyoake, "History of Cooperation" (Fisher, Unwin; 1905, 21s.); G. Wallas, "History of the Poor Law" (in the Cooperative Wholesale Society's Annual, 1894, 4d.); P. Monroe, "History of Education" (Macmillan, 1905, 5s. net).

The third class consists of descriptions of social and industrial conditions at various times and places. Such are F. Engels, "Condition of the English Working Classes in 1844" (Sonnenshein, 1892, 3s. 6d.); C. Booth, "Life and Labor of the People in London"(1) (Macmillan, 17 vols., 1903, 80s. net); A. Sherwell, "Life in West London" (Methuen, 1897, 2s. 6d.); B. S. Rown-

(1) This great work ought to be in every library of any consequence in the three kingdoms.

tree, "Poverty, a Study of Town Life"* (Macmillan, 1902, 6s.); E. Jebb, "Cambridge, A Brief Study of Social Questions" (Macmillan and Bowes, 1906, 3s. 6d net); R. Hunter, "Poverty" (Macmillan, 1905, 6s. 6d. net).

In yet a fourth class may be counted all descriptions of specific social problems and of the attempts to deal with them. Of this kind are G. Newman, "Infant Mortality" (Methuen, 1906, 7s. 6d. net); P. Alden, "The Unemployed"* (King, 1905, 1s. net); J. Spargo, "The Bitter Cry of the Children" (Macmillan, 1906, 6s. 6d. net); B. Meakin, "Model Factories and Villages" (Unwin, 1905, 7s. 6d.); Sir J. E. Gorst, "The Children of the Nation"* (Methuen, 1906, 7s. 6d.); W. Thompson, "The Housing Handbook" (King, 1904, 2s. 6d. net); R. Mudie Smith, "Sweated Industries"* (Bradbury, Agnew & Co., 1906, 6d. net); F. Lawson Dodd, "The Problem of the Milk Supply"* (Balliere, 1904, 1s. 6d. net), and the bound volume of "Fabian Tracts"* (3 Clement's Inn, W. C., 1906, 4s. 6d.).

4. *Related Literature.*—It is almost impossible to make any satisfactory classification of the numerous works that I would group under this heading. For it includes practically all books touching on social questions which cannot be included in any of the foregoing divisions; the books that stimulate our minds socially, that create the mental "atmosphere" in which we become alert towards social facts and their bearing on social problems. For instance, there are books describing countries as a whole, like H. G. Wells, "The Future in America," or Sir H. Plunkett, "Ireland in the New Century." There are surveys of whole industries, like H. Rider Haggard, "Rural England"; S. J. Chapman,

"The Lancaster Cotton Industry," or A. Shadwell's study of *Industrial Efficiency* in England, Germany and America. Then there are scientific works connected with pressing questions, like J. Cantlie, "Physical Efficiency"; R. Hutchinson, "Food and Dietetics," or G. Stanley Hall, "Adolescence." Again, there are volumes of essays, such as R. Jefferies, "The Toilers of the Fields"; J. Ruskin, "Time and Tide"* and "Fors Clavigera";* E. Carpenter's "England's Ideal"; J. E. Hand, "Good Citizenship"; Bishop Westcott, "Social Aspects of Christianity." Further, there are many novels; for instance, Charles Dickens, "Hard Times"; Benjamin Disraeli, "Sybil"; George Eliot, "Felix Holt"; W. Barry, "The New Antigone," "The Wizard's Knot," "The Dayspring"; H. G. Wells, "The Wonderful Visit," "Kipps," "When the Sleeper Wakes," "In the Days of the Comet," and numerous works by Leo Tolstoi, Upton Sinclair, Jack London, Arthur Morrison, W. Pett Ridge, Isabella Ford, May Quinlan, Joseph Clayton, George Gissing, and many more. Lastly, there are poems, like E. B. Browning's "The Cry of the Children"; T. Hood's "The Song of the Shirt"; O. Wilde's "Ballad of Reading Gaol"; and plays like Henrik Ibsen's "Pillars of Society," "An Enemy of the People," and "Peer Gynt"; and G. B. Shaw's "Candida," "Widowers' Houses," and "Mrs. Warren's Profession."(1)

C. Observation and Experiment.—As with other sciences, so with social science, oral instruction and books are of use in preparation and guide for observa-

(1) Of course, many of the works mentioned under "Related Literature" are not, therefore, recommended for young and inexperienced students. A few are of the nature of social pathology; a quite necessary branch of social study, but not for the beginner.

tion and experiment, not as substitutes for them. It is impossible to deal effectually with social problems if we know them only in the lecture-room and in the library. We must study them first-hand; we must see for ourselves the effects of social disorganization on men and women of like nature to our own; we must endeavor to realize as far as possible by actual contact what manner of lives are led by "the other half," before we can in any correct sense be said to *understand* social questions. In other words, we must correct the formulæ and abstractions of the learned by constant comparison with life and its myriad intricacies or, for all our pains, we shall remain but "blind leaders of the blind." And there is no such thorough corrective of windy theorizings for or against our fellow men as the devotion of ourselves for however short a period to their personal service. It was shrewdly said by the warden of one of the university settlements in London that most of the undergraduates came to the settlement expecting to "teach the working classes," but they soon found that they had less to teach than to learn. And the remark is applicable to others besides undergraduates. If social studies be not begun and continued in a spirit of humility and constant willingness to learn, they are worse than useless, and only lead to the production of those most exasperating and obstructive of human beings, the doctrinaire, the cynic and the "superior person."

It is much to be wished that our Catholic schools were in a position to imitate the example of the greater Protestant public schools, and each support, at least partially, a "school mission" in some neglected corner of a great city. Yet, though individually they have neither

the numbers nor the funds sufficient to imitate Eton or Winchester or Clifton, something might be done by combination. Why should not, for example, the Benedictine schools *combine* to support a mission in Bristol, the Jesuit schools another in Birmingham, and the secular schools a third in Newcastle, and so on? It would be difficult, of course, but not necessarily impossible, and the very effort required and interest excited would not be without their educative value. Any one can find out what *can* be done in that way in R. Dolling's description of the Westchester mission in "Ten Years in a Portsmouth Slum."(1) And if Protestants have the faith and energy to do these things, why should they be impossible for Catholics?

Another means of training in Catholic citizenship would be work in homes for Catholic children, as in Father Bans' Homes for Boys, or Father Berry's Homes for Destitute Children, or Mr. Norman Potter's excellent "home" at St. Hugh's Balham. Any one who will be *friendly, instead of patronizing,* to poor children will learn much that is otherwise hid from him of their thoughts, their struggles and oftentimes their heroism.

Then there are clubs for working boys or girls, where it is personal service rather than money that is so much needed; committee work or, at least, membership of charitable or reform societies;(2) *active* membership of the great Society of St. Vincent de Paul; and generally all the training that comes from making friends with our

---

(1) Cf. also J. Clayton, *Father Dolling;* a Memoir, 1902.

(2) *e.g.*, The Anti-Swearing League, 133 Salisbury Square, E. C.; the Agricultural Organization Society, Dacre House, Dacre street, S. W., or the Garden City Association, 348 Birkbeck Bank Chambers, W. C.

poorer neighbors, helping them as best we can, and keeping our eyes open and our sympathy active.

I have now indicated the chief means whereby any who desire it can acquire both the knowledge and the training necessary for adequately dealing with social problems. Perhaps to some the way may seem hard, the results not worth the effort, the whole matter dreary and uninteresting. Yet, entirely apart from the consideration that some work of this kind is the *duty* of every leisured and well-to-do Catholic,(1) I would urge that all social inquiries are likely to prove of real interest to those who will engage in them. There are discoveries to be made, dragons to be slain, wrongs to be righted on all sides. Is our inquiry into the food supplies of great cities? Then we may learn how babies die like flies because the only milk they can get is poisoned with preservatives yet swarming with micro-organisms; how Canadian Salmon lie in festering heaps in the sun before they are boiled and canned for the English market; how Somerset farmers adulterate their cheese with oil to replace the butter they have taken from the milk. Are we interested in the suppression of "sweated" industries? We shall discover how cigarette cases are made up for 4½d. *per thousand,* resulting in the magnificent weekly income of 8s.; how cheap Bibles are folded at the rate of 1d. *per hundred sheets,* so that, with twelve hours' work a day, one can earn 9s. a week; how farmers in this West Country expect a boy of thirteen to work 14½ hours a day for 6½ days a week and pay him the princely wage of 3s. 9d. Do we Catholics agree with Leo XIII, that "it is in great measure within the

(1) Cf. The passage from Leo XIII, *Graves de Communi,* that I have placed at the beginning of this article.

circle of family life that the destiny of the State is fostered"?(1) We shall judge what encouragement is given to family life and morality in England when in London thousands of families, averaging five persons of all ages, have "homes" of one room; when decent families are driven to wander in the streets, or to seek admission to the hated workhouse, because they cannot find *that* accommodation; when in a single district of Somerset an inquirer can be shown a row of six cottages, each with but two little bedrooms, and each inhabited by a man and his wife and a growing family, *besides two male lodgers.*

There is work indeed in plenty for any lover of his country, for any man or woman who would rather see England just and clean and merciful than England rich and foul and pitiless. It was "Merrie England" once. Can any one who knows the facts pretend it is so now? *Messis quindem multa, operarii autem pauci. Rogate ergo Dominum messis, ut mittat operarios in messem suam.*

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE,
Downside Review.

(1) Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Christianae.*

MEANY PRINTING CO.
S.W. COR 6TH AVE. AND 11TH ST. N.Y.

335
L55 - XIII

11225